

THE
CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.

SEPTEMBER, 1869.

ART. I. — THE EARLY HISTORY OF MASSACHUSETTS.

Lectures delivered in a Course before the Lowell Institute, in Boston, by Members of the Massachusetts Historical Society, on Subjects relating to the Early History of Massachusetts. Boston: Published by the Society. 1869. 8vo. pp. 498.

THE founders of the Colony of Massachusetts Bay were men of sturdy convictions and resolute will, who came hither with well-defined aims and purposes. Yet, strangely enough, it has become matter of controversy what those aims and purposes were, and how far those single-minded and single-hearted men were true to their own idea of a Christian Commonwealth. It was with the view of presenting in a popular way a restatement of their avowed purposes and of the methods by which they sought to accomplish their objects, but with no wish to excite fresh controversy, that this course of Lowell Lectures was originally planned, and that the several lectures have now been printed, most of them in an enlarged form. The design was as praiseworthy as it was difficult of execution; and too much credit cannot be awarded to the Rev. Dr. Ellis, by whom the preparation of such a course of lectures was first suggested, and through whose zeal, energy, and perseverance as chairman of the committee of arrangements, the plan was successfully carried out. We need scarcely add that their preparation and subsequent publication afford new evidence of the value of the munificent gift

which was designed to furnish precisely such mental food to the citizens of Boston, and which has, from the first, been administered with rare ability and success.

The subjects selected for treatment all relate to the period under the first charter; and throughout the volume a certain unity of plan and a general harmony of views on the more important questions are apparent. But on incidental points there is considerable diversity of opinion, and each lecture is more or less shaped and colored by the personal tastes and habits of its author. Not only is there the variety of style which one would expect to find in the productions of any twelve gentlemen not under editorial supervision, but we find also two entirely distinct kinds of composition,—the popular lecture, and the elaborate essay. To the first class belongs the admirable discourse of Mr. Eliot on the “Early Relations with the Indians,” which, in the narrow limits of twelve pages and a half, presents an eloquent and altogether satisfactory account of the efforts to Christianize the natives; and to the second class belongs Judge Parker’s thorough examination of “The First Charter and the Early Religious Legislation of Massachusetts,” which, if it is not conclusive as to the intent of the persons by whom the charter was procured, at least leaves little room for doubt on the subject, and which fully justifies its claim to fill eighty-two pages. Between these two extremes, which may very properly be taken as types of two distinct methods of dealing with the subjects selected for consideration, the lectures or essays vary in length from nineteen pages to fifty pages, and not more than two or three of the lectures could have been read within the allotted space of one hour.

The key-note to the whole discussion was struck by Dr. Ellis at the very commencement of his first lecture, in a citation from Governor Winthrop’s “Model of Christian Charity,” written on board the *Arbella* on her passage to New England. After describing his companions as persons who professed themselves fellow-members of Christ, their great leader declared that the work which they had in hand was “by a mutual consent, through a special overruling Providence and a

more than an ordinary approbation of the churches of Christ, to seek out a place of cohabitation and consortship under a due form of government, both civil and ecclesiastical." It is this avowed purpose of the Fathers to establish here a Christian Commonwealth, "that ourselves and posterity may be the better preserved from the common corruptions of this evil world, to serve the Lord and work out our own salvation under the power and purity of his holy ordinances," which each of the lecturers assumes as the basis of his discourse, and seeks to illustrate with more or less of fulness.

A detailed examination of each lecture would require more space than we have at command; but a brief enumeration of the subjects will show the general plan of the course, and indicate in some degree the manner in which it has been executed. The Introductory, by the Hon. Robert C. Winthrop, has, indeed, a wide scope, and might seem at the first glance disconnected from those which follow; but on a more careful reading it will be found to be entirely in harmony with them, and to present some important considerations in regard to the influence of the physical conditions by which the Fathers were surrounded, on their character and history. Such a discussion was altogether appropriate to the time and place; and no one who is familiar with Mr. Winthrop's polished and graceful style need be told how admirably he has here done all that he undertook to do. His discourse is replete with felicitous statements and illustrations, and opens up many suggestive trains of thought. The remaining lectures of the course, besides the two already referred to, are: "The Aims and Purposes of the Founders of the Massachusetts Colony," and "Treatment of Intruders and Dissentients by the Founders of Massachusetts," both by Rev. George E. Ellis, D.D., of Charlestown; "History of Grants under the Great Council for New England," by Mr. Samuel F. Haven, of Worcester; "The Colony of New Plymouth and its Relations to Massachusetts," by Mr. William Brigham; "Slavery as it once prevailed in Massachusetts," by the Hon. Emory Washburn, of Cambridge; "Records of Massachusetts under its First Charter," by the Hon. C. W. Upham, of Salem; "The Medical

Profession in Massachusetts," by Dr. O. W. Holmes; "The Regicides sheltered in New England," by the Rev. Chandler Robbins, D.D.; "Puritan Politics of England and New England," by Rev. Edward E. Hale; and "Education in Massachusetts: Early Legislation and History," by Mr. George B. Emerson. All are the productions of gentlemen thoroughly conversant with the facts and arguments bearing on the subjects assigned to them, and in each case the treatment is such as might have been anticipated from a knowledge of the special qualifications of the several lecturers. Among the best of the lectures are several to which the plan of this article will not permit further reference, although they deal with subjects of great interest. In the few remarks which we intend to offer, we shall confine ourselves to three or four points in the early history of Massachusetts, about which there are the greatest misapprehension and misrepresentation.

Perhaps the most important questions discussed in any of the lectures, are those relating to the transfer of the charter, and to the rights of the founders of Massachusetts under that instrument. These questions, indeed, underlie all the rest; and according to the answer which we give them, must be our estimate of the Fathers. If the transfer of the charter was merely a piece of successful trickery, and the government which was set up here was merely a successful usurpation, it will be impossible to vindicate the character of Winthrop and his associates. If the transfer of the government and the patent could not be done legally, the acts of Sir Edmund Andros and his dependants were not infringements of the rights of the inhabitants of Massachusetts, and our ancestors had little just ground of complaint against him. On the other hand, if the founders of the colony had the rights and powers which they claimed to have, then the judgment against the Massachusetts charter did not differ in kind from the proceedings against the municipal and other corporations in England, the New-England Revolution of 1689 was as "glorious" as the English Revolution of 1688, and our ancestors had as good cause for imprisoning Andros, as the people of

England had for driving James II. from the kingdom. It is to a consideration of these questions that Judge Parker devotes a large part of the lecture to which we have already referred; and in it he maintains these five propositions: that the charter is not, and was not intended to be, merely an act of incorporation for a trading company; that it authorized the establishment of the government of the colony within the limits of the territory to be governed; that it gave ample powers of legislation and of government for the plantation or colony, in the manner in which the grantees and their associates claimed and exercised the legislative power; that it authorized the exclusion of all persons whom the grantees and their associates should see fit to exclude from the colony, and the exclusion of those already settled as a punishment for offences; and that it authorized the creation and erection of courts to determine causes and render judgment, without any appeal to the English courts.

These propositions, which we have given very nearly in Judge Parker's own words, cover the whole ground; and if they can be successfully maintained, the right of the founders of Massachusetts to transfer the government and patent across the Atlantic, to exercise plenary authority here, and to banish or otherwise punish Antinomians, Quakers, and all other persons whose presence they thought dangerous to the peace and well-being of the Commonwealth, cannot be denied. The question is not as to the expediency of their laws or of their proceedings under those laws, but it is as to their right under the charter to set up a popular government here, and to enact such laws as they deemed to be necessary for the protection of the community. The transfer of the charter, as we know from abundant evidence, was a deliberate and carefully considered act; and it is beyond the possibility of doubt that the founders of the colony believed that they had a legal right to make the transfer. In the agreement executed at Cambridge, Aug. 26, 1629, and signed by Saltonstall, Dudley, Winthrop, and nine others, it was expressly stipulated as the condition of their removal to America, "that before the last of September next, the whole gov-

ernment, together with the patent for the said plantation, be first, by an order of court, legally transferred and established to remain with us and others which shall inhabit upon the said plantation." This agreement was the fruit of much previous consultation among the leaders of the enterprise, and was substantially in accordance with a proposition made by Governor Cradock at a General Court held about a month before, on the 28th of July, that the company should transfer the government of the plantation to those that should inhabit there, and not to continue the same in subordination to the Company in England. Apparently Governor Cradock's proposition did not include a transfer of the patent as well as of the government, and in this respect it fell short of the conditions required by the Cambridge agreement; but when the subject came up at an adjourned meeting of the General Court, on the 29th of August, the question was so put as to cover the whole ground and leave no room for doubt as to the effect of the vote, — "As many of you as desire to have the patent and the government of the Plantation to be transferred to New England, so as it may be done legally, hold up your hands; so many as will not, hold up your hands." A great majority voted in favor of the transfer, and the decision is so recorded. "Where, by erection of hands," is the language of the record, "it appeared by the general consent of the company, that the government and patent should be settled in New England, and accordingly an order to be drawn up." A few weeks afterward Winthrop was chosen governor; and at a little later period, Saltonstall, Johnson, Dudley, and all but three of their associates in the Cambridge agreement, were duly chosen to office in the company. Their acceptance of office, after the right and power of the grantees and their associates to make the transfer had been so long under consideration, affords strong evidence that the persons most interested in the question were satisfied the transfer could be made legally and effectually; and if any thing is needed to strengthen this evidence, it is found in the fact mentioned by Judge Parker, that the legality of the transfer was not officially called in question until July, 1679, nearly half a century afterward.

When we turn from the external evidence afforded by the actual transfer of the charter and the silent acquiescence of all parties in its transfer during nearly fifty years, to the evidence which we may draw from the provisions contained in the instrument itself, and also from the omission of certain other provisions, we are at once struck by the fact that the charter nowhere provides that the corporation created by it shall be established at any specified place, or that the powers conferred on the grantees shall be exercised in England. On the other hand, as Judge Parker points out, there are powers granted which it would have been very difficult, if not impossible, for the company to exercise, except within the territorial limits of the colony. For instance, the corporation had the power to admit new members or freemen from time to time, as might be deemed expedient, who, when so admitted, were to enjoy the same right of attending the four General Courts and of voting for the various officers which the original grantees possessed. Now, it will hardly be maintained by any one, that the colonists were to be excluded from all voice in the selection of the officers placed over them, and that the affairs of the colony, which they had crossed the ocean to found, were to be exclusively managed by persons who had no personal interest in it; but if the meetings or General Courts of the company, as they were called, were to be held in England, it would have been clearly impossible for those freemen who resided in Massachusetts to attend them, and such persons would have been as much excluded as if there had been an express proviso that they should not be made freemen of the company. We must either accept this conclusion, or we must maintain that the true intent of the charter was, that the colonists might become members of the corporation, and that its powers should be exercised by them and their associates within the territorial limits granted to the company.

If, on the theory that the powers of the company were to be exercised in England, the difficulty in regard to the provisions respecting the admission of new members is great, it is still greater in respect to the choice or removal of the vari-

ous officers, and the administration of official oaths. The charter provided that once a year, at a General Court, to be held in Easter term, the Governor, Deputy-Governor, assistants, and "all other officers of the said company," should be chosen by a majority vote of the freemen "then and there present," and that immediately after such election the power of their predecessors in office should cease and determine; and there is a similar provision in regard to the vacancies created by the death or removal of any officer,—express power being given to remove any officer for cause. It was further provided, that, before entering upon the discharge of his official duties, every officer should take oath for the faithful performance of his duties in a certain prescribed manner,—the Governor before the Deputy-Governor or two assistants; and the Deputy-Governor, assistants, "and all other officers," before the Governor. The obvious interpretation of these clauses would seem to be, that all these officers were expected to be within easy access of one another, and not that three thousand miles of a stormy ocean should intervene between them. On the supposition that the colony was to be governed by a company established in England, and that only a portion of its officers were to reside in Massachusetts, Judge Parker very justly remarks, that in case of the death of an officer whose duties were to be performed in the colony, "it would take a month for the intelligence of the decease to reach the company in England, and at least a month or six weeks more, ordinarily a much longer time, for a notice of the new election to reach the colony; during which time there would be no regular officer to perform the duties." In view of so absurd and inconvenient an arrangement, we may safely adopt the express words of the charter, and maintain that it is to be "construed, reputed, and adjudged, in all cases, most favorably on the behalf and for the benefit and behoof of the said Governor and company and their successors." A similar remark will apply to the clauses about oaths, in the execution of which there would have been even greater difficulties and absurdities. "If the company remained in England," as Judge Parker remarks, "and the General Courts were held

there, all the officers chosen for the managing and despatching of the business of the company, who resided in the plantation, and most of them must be there, would have to go to England to take their oaths of office, before they could execute their offices; or the Governor would be obliged to be in the plantation to administer the oaths there, after notice who were elected; and after each annual election, the Deputy-Governor or two assistants must first administer the oath to him, before he could go to the plantation; or, if he were there, must go themselves to the plantation to find him and administer the oath there, before he could administer the oaths to others." It would scarcely be possible to conceive of a more awkward and cumbersome arrangement; and we are not justified by a single provision in the charter, in concluding that the persons who made the original draft were so unskilful as not to see that this difficulty must inevitably arise, if the powers which they sought to acquire could only be exercised by a corporation established in England. On the contrary, we are led, of necessity, to conclude that the true construction of the charter authorized its transfer to America, and that its framers anticipated the condition of things which afterward existed, when Winthrop and his associates entered into the agreement at Cambridge.

The powers granted to the company for the government of the plantation were, and were intended to be, ample. They are prefaced by an explicit declaration that "the good and prosperous success of the plantation of the said parts of New England, aforesaid . . . cannot but chiefly depend, next under the blessing of Almighty God, and the support of our royal authority, upon the good government of the same"; and for this end the grantees were made "one body corporate and politic in fact and in name," with various powers and immunities, very different from those which would have been necessary or expedient for a mere trading company. Among the powers thus given were an express authority to the grantees and the officers appointed by them "to encounter, expulse, repel, and resist, by force of arms and by all fitting ways and means whatsoever, all such person and persons, as shall at any time

hereafter attempt or enterprise the destruction, detriment, or annoyance of the said plantation or inhabitants, and to take and surprise, by all ways and means whatsoever, all and every such person or persons with their ships, armor, munition, and other goods, as shall in hostile manner invade, or attempt the defeating of the said plantation, or the hurt of the said company and inhabitants," — in other words, to wage defensive war, whenever the company and its officers should think proper, and without other authority from the Crown; authority to make "all manner of wholesome and reasonable orders, laws, statutes, ordinances, directions, and instructions, not contrary to the laws of this our realm of England," to establish all necessary forms and ceremonies of government and magistracy, to create such officers as they should deem needful, to order elections, and in general to do all things necessary for the religious, peaceable, and civil government of the inhabitants. The grant of powers so ample as these, which by necessary implication carried with them various inferior powers, furnished a solid basis for the claims of the founders of Massachusetts.

Next in importance to the questions as to the transfer of the charter and to the powers granted by that instrument is the question as to the aims and purposes of the founders of the colony, which forms the subject of Dr. Ellis's first lecture. It has been very commonly said, and even by writers of the highest authority, that the Fathers of Massachusetts came here to establish a refuge for civil and religious freedom; and because they enacted laws and inflicted punishments which tended to abridge what we call "liberty of conscience," they have been accused of gross inconsistency. To this view of their aims Dr. Ellis takes exception, maintaining with signal ability that their purpose was to establish a Bible Commonwealth, in which every man's conduct was to be tried by Bible precedents and laws, and especially by the Mosaic code, so far as it could be made applicable to their situation. To this statement of their aims and purposes there can be no valid objection. The liberty which our ancestors sought to establish here was a liberty regulated by law; and there can

be no greater fallacy than the notion that they meant to establish a home for all the uneasy consciences that might flock here. But we are not prepared to accept Dr. Ellis's statement that they left England to get away from an unbridled liberty of conscience. "They had begun to see around them," he says, "in their native England, the threatenings of some of the effects and results of just what we mean by liberty of conscience, and they shuddered at them. Their dread of those consequences was one of the satisfactions which they afterwards found in their exile. It would be much nearer the truth, — indeed, it is the truth itself, — and it would be truer to all the facts of the case, to the integrity of history, and to the right use of terms which get changed in their import and burden, to say frankly and boldly, that our Fathers came here to get away from, to get rid of, such liberty of conscience, as to them a hateful, pernicious, and ruinous thing, sure to result in impiety and anarchy." While we entirely agree with Dr. Ellis, that the founders of the Massachusetts Colony had not a particle of sympathy with the licentiousness of opinions and beliefs which he describes, we do not believe that those wild notions had become so widely diffused in England at the time of the Great Emigration that the desire to escape from them was the chief or even a principal motive of our Fathers in leaving England. If we read their motives aright, it was to escape from the prelates, and not from Levellers and Fifth-monarchy men in embryo, that they came here. With this exception, we find but little in Dr. Ellis's lecture to which we cannot yield a hearty assent; and many of his propositions are stated with a clearness, precision, and force which leave nothing to be added or qualified by a subsequent writer. Such for instance is this statement of the purposes of the Fathers: "Their lofty and soul-enthraling aim — the condition and reward of all their severe sufferings and arduous efforts — was the establishment and administration here of a religious and civil commonwealth, which should bear the same relation to the spirit and the letter of the whole Bible that the Jewish commonwealth bore to the law of Moses." It is precisely here that Dr. Ellis finds the key to all the vari-

ous movements of our colonial history ; and the whole policy of the founders, as he abundantly shows, was guided by this idea of establishing on these shores a Bible Commonwealth.

That such an experiment as they aimed to try here must fail was inevitable. "To construct a commonwealth out of a Church, as the honored and noble Winthrop so frankly avowed it," says Dr. Ellis, "and to administer all civil affairs by church-members, — that was the intent of the founders of this colony." For this purpose it was essential that the whole community should be composed of men of as deep convictions and as incorruptible principles as the Fathers themselves, that they should be able to exclude all who were not of like opinions with themselves, and that they should be allowed undisturbed possession of the territory on which they meant to try their experiment ; and they thought they had secured these conditions. Their charter gave them a perfect title to the soil. It gave them also the right to choose their own associates. It gave them the right to banish all who should attempt to annoy them in their work. But this was not enough. It is the tendency of all such enterprises to lose their hold on the hearts and minds of the younger members ; doubt and indifference creep in ; opposition arises from without ; and the attempt to preserve or restore unity of opinion only increases the difficulty. This our Fathers found very early. As Dr. Ellis pointedly says, "They could not create a State out of a church ; for a State grew up which would not come into their church, and which they would not have allowed to come into it. They could not administer a civil government by biblical statutes ; for those statutes have God, not man, for their administrator. That liberty of conscience which they themselves, and for themselves, had put under restraining subjection to their own covenants and religious limitations, was irresistibly exercised by some among them, and by a continual succession of new-comers."

How they treated these dissentients and intruders is a question only less important than the question as to their own aims and purposes ; and its discussion very properly forms the subject of Dr. Ellis's second lecture, — the third of the

course. After a brief restatement of some of the positions which he had advanced in his first lecture, respecting the dislike of the founders of Massachusetts for all special revelations and all eccentricities of opinion, followed by some remarks on the distinction which the authorities observed in their treatment of dissentients and of intruders, he proceeds to take up separately the cases of Roger Williams, of Mrs. Hutchinson and her followers, and of the Quakers. Each of these subjects is examined at length, and with marked fairness; though the treatment is not, on the whole, we think, quite so satisfactory as his discussion of similar matters in his first lecture. The account of Roger Williams, however, is especially candid and judicious, and is worthy of the more notice from the fact, that sympathy with Williams's principles and respect for his forgiving temper lead many persons to look only on the more attractive side of his character. If he was in many respects in advance of his contemporaries, and in his later years exhibited a rare magnanimity, we must not forget that he was of a very litigious disposition, and that it was impossible for other men to live at peace with him. It is true that he was young and impetuous when he first came here, and that much allowance must therefore be made for his errors at Salem and Plymouth. But age did little to chill his ardor and his love of controversy. His last publication was a controversial work against the Quakers, with the punning title, "George Fox digged out of his Burrowes"; and one of the last acts of his life was to row a boat from Providence to Newport, that he might hold a public disputation with three Quakers. He was, in fine, as Dr. Ellis remarks, precisely what he was called by John Quincy Adams, "a conscientious, contentious man"; and never having been admitted a freeman of the company, he was here only on sufferance. If he had been content to live here peaceably, and not have attacked the authority of the magistrates and vilipended the churches, he might have been one of the most honored and beloved of the colonists; but he had no gift of silence, and his banishment was merely the exercise by the magistrates of the right of self-defence against one whose continued

presence here they regarded as a perpetual source of danger.

It is well known that Dr. Ellis has made the early history of the Quakers the subject of special investigation; and in dealing with this branch of his subject he has illustrated his positions by numerous references to rare tracts and unpublished manuscripts. We cannot help thinking, however, that in his calm, careful, and candid balancing of the facts in the case, he has been too lenient in his judgment of these "intrusive, pestering, indecent, and railing disturbers" of the colony. There is no point in the early history of Massachusetts more clear than this, that the Quakers were the aggressors in their struggle with the lawful authorities of the colony, or, as Dr. Ellis well expresses it, that "they wantonly initiated the strife, and with a dogged pertinacity persisted in outrages which drove the authorities almost to frenzy; while with a stiff temper of audacity, as the authorities saw it, but of fidelity to holy duty, as they felt, they courted the extreme penalties which they might at any moment have escaped, except through constraint of their 'inspirations.'" They did not spring up within the colony, but they came hither unbidden, in the face of laws expressly prohibiting their entrance; and when sent away, under the authority of that provision of the charter which gave the company power to expel any person who should attempt to annoy the plantation or the inhabitants, they returned once and again, to pour out more scurrilous abuse on the church and the magistrates, and to indulge in more gross violations of decency. They were, indeed, ignorant, deluded, and self-willed men and women, whose heads were filled with crude notions, whose lips poured out foul-mouthed abuse on the leaders of the community into which they forced themselves, and whose conduct was such as no civilized society could tolerate for a moment. It is but a small palliation of their outrages against law and decency to say that their lives were pure; for their acts were such as people our houses of correction and lunatic asylums, and human laws deal not with motives, but with overt acts. As Dr. Ellis truly says, "Our Fathers cared little, if at all, for

the Quaker theology. They did not get so far as that in dealing with them. Not being inclined to accept the account which the Quakers gave of themselves as being under the peculiar guidance of the Holy Spirit, our Fathers dealt with them on the score of their manners, their lawlessness, and their offensive speech and manners." That our Fathers were justified in enacting and enforcing the penalty of death as a punishment for coming back after banishment, no one at this day will maintain; but there was no defect in their title to the soil, and in expelling the Quakers they were simply doing what we do whenever we expel an intruder from our premises, either in town or country. In banishing or imprisoning, they were enforcing well-known laws, which they thought were necessary to the safety of the community, which were upheld by the public sentiment, and which cannot be regarded as disproportionate to the offences of the Quakers against public peace and public morality.

Another subject about which a good deal of misrepresentation has gathered within a few years, is the history of slavery in Massachusetts, — how far it was legally established here, how it was regarded by the founders of the colony, and what was its character. For the thorough discussion of this much vexed question no one was so well qualified by previous research as Governor Washburn; and his exhaustive examination of it fully justifies his selection for the work. He has stated with singular clearness and force all the important facts and arguments bearing on the subject, and no one not persistently wedded to a different theory can withhold his assent to the conclusions here reached. That slavery existed in Massachusetts at a very early period is a fact of historical record; and that it was not a subject over which the colony could exercise much control is not less certain. "So far as negro slavery was concerned," says Governor Washburn, "their power to act at all was exceedingly circumscribed. They could prohibit neither the importation nor the sale of slaves without clashing at once with the interests and wishes of government at home." All that they could do was to regulate the *status* of the children of slaves born in the colony; and this they

appear to have done. The Body of Liberties, which was adopted in 1641, expressly declares that "There shall never be any Bond Slavery, Villinage, or Captivity amongst us, unless it be lawful Captives taken in just Wars, and such strangers as willingly sell themselves, or are sold to us," — a provision of which the obvious intent was to exclude from slavery all persons born on the soil of Massachusetts. Whether any person ever sold himself into slavery under the second of the above provisions is not known; but there are some instances in which criminals were sold as a punishment, and a considerable number of captives taken in war were likewise reduced to bondage. But at no time was the number of slaves large. In 1680, half a century after the settlement of Boston, the number is stated by Governor Bradstreet to have been about one hundred or one hundred and twenty. In 1708 the number had increased, according to Governor Dudley's estimate, to four hundred and fifty. In 1745, when their number is supposed to have been the largest, Dr. Belknap thinks their proportion to the whites was as one to forty. From that time slavery in Massachusetts began to decline; and in 1763 the proportion had fallen to one in forty-five. At that time there were in Virginia five blacks to four whites. In 1780, slavery was virtually abolished by the adoption of the State Constitution; and after the final decision in the case of Quork Walker, in 1783, it ceased to exist, — having fallen under a public sentiment which had existed from the first, but had grown so rapidly during the struggle with the mother country, that Burke, in his speech on "Conciliation with America," enumerated it among the causes of the quarrel. As Dr. Belknap remarked seventy-five years ago, "It appears that slavery did exist in a small proportion; that the laws discountenanced it, and the public sentiment was against it; but that the evil was not eradicated."

These are the chief points in the early history of Massachusetts about which there has been the most controversy; and in respect to each of them we may say, that the more the subject is investigated the less ground will be found for criticism on the Fathers. So long as the controversy deals only

with their legal rights under the charter, the position which they maintained cannot be successfully assailed. When it approaches their purposes in coming here, we have their own explicit declarations as to their objects and aims. When it touches the expediency and justice of their laws and the penalties which they inflicted for the various infringements of those laws, we must be careful not to carry the ideas and principles of the nineteenth century into the seventeenth; but judging them by the opinions prevalent in their own age, and by the light which they themselves enjoyed, there will be no need to apologize for their undeniable mistakes, and for their failure to realize the true idea of a Christian Commonwealth.

ART. II. — THE CAUCUS SYSTEM.

Prize Essays of The Loyal League of Philadelphia. Published in 1868.

THE Philadelphia Loyal League published, a few months ago, four prize essays upon "The Legal Organization of the People to select Candidates for Office," in other words, the legalization of caucuses, as a means of securing the nomination of better and more competent men as candidates. The essays received considerable attention and some commendation at the time; but they soon passed from the mind of the public, and, as a practical remedy for notorious abuses, may be pronounced a failure. It could hardly have been otherwise. If caucuses were made legal bodies, and invested with legal powers, it is obvious that they would have the same relation to the people that the elections have now, and would themselves be controlled by preliminary meetings of precisely the same irresponsible character with the present caucuses. The only result would be, that there would be one more medium through which to strain the popular will: whether it would be purified and made more energetic by this, may well be doubted.

The need of reform is apparent enough. The people, who wish to be well governed, seem powerless and inert in the midst of corruption and misgovernment. We welcomed, last winter, the incoming of a new administration, which was untrammelled by party traditions, and would be able, it was hoped, to govern the country for itself, not in the interest of politicians. In this, we have been partially disappointed. The administration has been itself uncorrupt and sagacious; it promises good work, honesty and economy. But in regard to appointments to office, it has been too much under the control of politicians, and has disgraced itself by more indiscriminate removals and more unfit appointments than even the average of administrations have been guilty of. With what face can Republicans criticise the corruptions of Democratic administrations, when their own President has sent a city politician of the lowest type, who stands publicly charged with every crime, from debauchery and murder down to petty swindling, — distinguished by eminence neither as a civilian nor as a soldier, — to represent us at the proud and ancient court of Spain? General Sickles can hardly have been selected for Madrid in the hope that his presence, as a representative of republicanism, would turn the wavering scale in favor of the institutions of his own country. We have, ourselves, no knowledge whatever of the truth of the charges against him. But, for the credit of the government, and in the interest of public morals, they should receive some better answer than his seasonable services to the Republican party.

The difficulty is to get the community thoroughly aroused to the need of reform. The natural indolence and indifference of most men, in regard to every thing which does not immediately touch their private interests, all play directly into the hands of the politicians. Most men are conservative in matters of form: there are theories, too, that have a strong hold on the popular mind, and are a great obstacle to reform. The *laissez-faire* doctrine is held in a vague way by many who do not give themselves the trouble to ask what it really means, and what are its necessary limitations. Things will settle themselves in the long-run, it is held, by the unrestrained workings

of natural laws. But what if natural laws have no room for free working? It is the easiest thing in the world thus to throw off responsibility: it is not so easy to *define* the responsibility, to distinguish between those natural laws which will have their way in spite of us and those which may be neutralized by our neglect or opposition. No doubt, gold will flow to the country where its purchasing-power is greatest; prices will fluctuate with supply and demand; wages will be determined by the proportion of labor and capital: these are things that no legislation can control. But hostile legislation might prevent the freedmen of the South from becoming land-owners; although no positive legislation is required to make them such, in a country where land is cheap and abundant and population sparse. So in politics: laws cannot make men honest and intelligent, it is true; but they can provide institutions which shall give an advantage to rogues, rather than free play to honesty and intelligence. This is what we have done.

This indolent theory sometimes finds expression in Pope's oft-quoted lines, —

“For forms of government let fools contest;
That which is best administered is best.”

As well say that it makes no difference what steam-engine the manufacturer purchases, or what ship the merchant sends his goods in, — all depends on the skill of the engineer and captain. Most certainly the best ship and the best engine can do nothing unless well managed; but, as certainly, in the most skilful hands the worn-out boiler will explode, and the unseaworthy ship founder. Natural laws, and the habits and dispositions of the people, will do much; but, after all, the object — a good government — is 'not attained, unless the machinery is good by which the popular will is brought to bear upon affairs of state.

The machinery which we use now in this country, for the purpose of guiding the popular action and bringing it to bear upon the objects desired, and in the way desired, is the system of caucuses or primary meetings; further developed

into the larger institutions, of conventions, and standing committees of party-managers. And some machinery of essentially this nature we must have. It needs to be said with emphasis, that, in a democracy, *the government is vested in the hands of persons with whom it is a matter of secondary interest.* The first business of every man is to provide himself with the means of living: when this is done, he may look after the public welfare. In this fact lies the great obstacle to the successful working of democratic institutions. In our feverish modern civilization, the sense of strong personal interest in good government hardly exists. Our business-men — the very ones who ought to govern the country — feel, whether rightly or wrongly, that they cannot spare the time from their business, to attend to public affairs. All that they are willing to do is, once or twice in the year to designate those whom they wish to have attend to these matters for them. It is all very well to say that this ought not to be so; that they ought to be willing to sacrifice a portion of their profits to the public welfare. The fact is, that they will not do this. And, as a result of this state of feeling, we see that the citizens of towns which have reached such a size that the amount and the complication of business engross business-men unduly, have devised a form of city government designed to meet just this state of feeling, by relieving citizens of all duties except voting. Perhaps it would have been possible to secure this relief without surrendering the active participation in public affairs so completely. The main fact remains, — that the inhabitants of small places have the leisure to govern themselves, while the inhabitants of large places have not; or think they have not, which amounts in practice to the same thing.

The same policy is followed in regard to the entire administration of State and national affairs, which are exclusively intrusted by our people, through periodical elections, to persons who, for the time being, make it their business to manage them. In these concerns we all admit that the citizen can do nothing but vote for names, — except indeed in those rare cases in which an important statute is submitted to the

popular verdict. But we do not always recognize precisely what the power of this vote is. We fancy, when we drop our ballots in the box, that we are voting for such and such men. This is a mistake. We are not voting for the men—they have been selected before by other persons; all that we do is, to express our desire—or, more correctly, our command as individual members of the political corporation—that a particular ticket, representing a particular set of political opinions, shall be accepted in preference to its rival.

Nor is there any thing in this inconsistent with the true principles of democracy. The legitimate function of the people, in political matters, is, not to do the work of government themselves, *but to see that it is done*; to determine the policy upon which they desire the government to be conducted, and then put in power men who are pledged to carry out this policy. And—so far from lamenting that the people forego their apparent right and duty to select their own rulers, by doing nothing but vote for candidates presented to them—this fact may be accepted as an indication that they practically understand and accept the necessary limitations to their functions,—that all they wish to do at an election is to express their will, by voting for a particular ticket, that the party which it represents shall be in power; leaving to the managers of that party the task of selecting the men whose names are to stand upon the ticket. But it also follows that—as the people do nothing but put a party in power, and have almost no control over the manner in which that party shall administer the government—some plan ought to be devised by which the selecting of candidates shall be done with more care, skill, and sense of responsibility than at present.

The caucuses and conventions, which at present actually govern this country, are wholly irresponsible and in large part self-appointed bodies: yet it is they that actually govern this country,—the people only deciding by their votes which of two rival organizations of similar nature shall at any given time possess the governing-power. This system is in its

origin a perfectly natural, and in many respects salutary, outgrowth of the character and habits of our people, and indeed of the English race. It is the way in which all matters of general interest are managed. Public meetings are called, committees are appointed, reports are made, — in churches, lyceums, schools, reform movements, every thing is done by a handful of men of special aptitude for this work and special interest in the thing to be done; under the eye and with the approval of the mass of persons who are less interested or less energetic, but who are willing to pay their share of the costs when called upon. These men are natural leaders; at least, in all cases, they possess some of the qualities of natural leaders, which make them by a necessary impulse put themselves at the head of whatever is done.

It was in self-governing communities of the purest type of democracy that the caucus-system first sprang up. Here, as elsewhere, it was necessary that business should be prepared before being presented to the people for their action. The primitive New-England way of meeting a night or two before the election and "marking" for candidates is perhaps the best possible method wherever the same elements exist as there; that is, an honest, intelligent community, vitally interested in having the work done well, and personally acquainted with all candidates. A constituency so different in every other point from these, as the alumni of Harvard College, adopted this method spontaneously in selecting candidates for overseers.

It is evident that where these conditions do not exist, — where the constituency is heterogeneous, absorbed in private interests, or of a low moral and intellectual standard, — this nominating system cannot be expected to work well. People will not, in the long-run, put themselves to much trouble for any thing in which they have not strong and direct personal interest. And it is a good deal of trouble to make out a long list of candidates: requiring, if the work is to be done well, an intimate acquaintance with the nature of the qualifications required for the different offices, and of those possessed by the different candidates; as well as a constant watchfulness in

political movements, with a view to availability as well as competency. It is no reflection upon the public spirit of a community, to say that nine men out of ten will leave the whole responsibility to the few who are peculiarly zealous, or who have a special taste for managing such matters, or who have private interests of their own to serve; and it does not require much consideration to see that of these three classes the last, having the most powerful inducements for activity, will be the most active. Or, if it be not admitted that this will naturally and necessarily be the case, it will not be denied that it is so as a matter of fact; and that "primary meetings" are as a rule managed by those who "have an axe to grind."

It appears, then, that the failure of our caucus-system was inherent in the very nature of things; that when this system was borrowed from the small democracies in which it had its origin, and extended to large communities of a totally different character, it must necessarily be controlled by a bad class of men. It is quite analogous to the failure of the Roman constitution, which had answered well enough for a small Italian town of homogeneous population, but broke down when extended over the whole of Italy. It has been said above that as soon as we pass from the small municipalities where alone pure democracy is practicable, the only function of the people is to determine the policy of government, leaving the details of administration to public functionaries; and that these public functionaries, though nominally chosen by the people, are really appointed by party-leaders. We have seen, further, who these party-leaders necessarily are, and what motives necessarily govern them; and when we add to this the fact that they are utterly irresponsible, while actually controlling the whole administration of affairs, we may fairly wonder that we are not worse governed than we are.

That we are not, is due chiefly to the fact, that, as there are all degrees of public interest between the active democracy of a New-England town and the complete indifference of large cities, there are comparatively few places in which the management is left entirely in the hands of self-seeking politicians. Everywhere the people wish a good government,

even if they are too indolent to secure it; and almost everywhere there are enough persons of character and standing who are willing to take part in primary meetings, and who thus place some slight check upon the worse elements in their party. Particularly, as soon as the offices become of State or national importance, a decent regard for public opinion will almost always prevent any very bad nomination. It is in the indirect power which professional politicians have over better men than themselves, that the chief evil consists.

It is no ground for discouragement, that our present method has failed, and must continue to fail, to give us a good government. If we are a practical people, as we claim to be, we shall not cease examining and experimenting, until we have discovered the cause of the failure and the remedy for it. We have the very best materials for a popular government. We have a people at a remarkably high average of intelligence and morality, who believe heartily in democracy, and who earnestly desire a good government. If with these elements a good government cannot be produced, it will prove that democracy is impossible at the present stage of human progress. The present machinery is clearly not adapted to produce the desired end. It gives us, instead of a democracy, an oligarchy of party-managers. It is our first object to rid ourselves of this.

It may very naturally be objected that these same party-managers will have the rule under whatever system, since those whose aims are purely personal and selfish will, as a rule, work more intensely and unremittingly than the honest and public-spirited leaders. This objection would be fatal to all hopes of reform, if it should be found impossible to devise any better machinery than we have now. So long as political life affords the present facilities for dishonest gain, the rogues will throng to it, and will outwit and shove aside the honest men. So soon as the means can be devised, of taking away from party-leaders their present excessive power, there will no longer be the temptation to those who have only selfish aims. There are always men enough of zeal and earnest patriotism, who would be glad to labor in the public service,

but who are now pushed into the background by "the men inside politics." There are enough such now to redeem partially the name of politician from the infamy which has become associated with it in this country. For men of this stamp to work with success in the preliminary labors in question, no such immoderate power is needed as is now possessed by party-leaders.

We have seen the irresponsibility of political managers. We have seen that the very nature of an extended democracy makes it necessary that all details of administration should be delegated by the people to somebody, and that they must fall ultimately to these managers, subject only to incidental moral control or check. This moral control is very considerable in the case of higher officials; although almost nothing in the subordinate ones. Now this moral control is principally indirect, in the reputation of each party for the character and ability of its nominees. The direct check which the people can exercise upon nominations, by refusing to vote for unfit ones, is very slight, because whoever takes this course, practically aids the opposite party,—a responsibility which few are willing to take. The dilemma of voting for an unfit person, or helping the opposite side, is one of the chief sources of power to party-leaders. The irresponsibility of nominating-conventions is bad enough, but it would lead to no very serious evils, if there were any adequate check upon them at the polls. But the final result of our vicious system is, to make them not only irresponsible, but almost absolute masters of political action.

The great necessity, therefore, is, some means of reducing the power of caucuses and nominating-conventions to its proper bounds, by making it possible for the people to reject their action at the polls without at the same time throwing away their sole political function by suffering the party policy to go by default. For this, we must appeal in some way to the principle of Personal Representation, which has been so fully discussed of late years.

We use the term "Personal Representation," rather than "Minority Representation," because it expresses more accu-

rately the essential character of the reform proposed, as well as its practical advantages. It is true, it promises a more equal representation of minorities ; but this is for the reason that it proposes to represent persons, not places, and to take away the excessive power now possessed by local politicians and local majorities. On the present plan, a small majority in one district balances a large majority in another ; and at any rate, when a single member is to be chosen in a limited constituency, the decrees of King Caucus are inviolable. Do away with districts, and with local constituencies of all kinds — give the people of a whole State the power of selecting candidates without regard to artificial boundary-lines — and the result will be a more genuinely democratic representation, and in all likelihood a more able and efficient one.

Indeed, the principle of representation needs, for its logical completeness, to have its mode of practical application defined in some such way. We have outgrown the old methods, because the circumstances under which they grew up no longer exist. When Representation was first introduced, there was no thought of representing the *people* as a whole ; certain communities, distinguished for wealth and population, and by the possession of certain corporate rights and privileges, were invited — or rather commanded — to send some of their members to act for them in the granting of taxes. The mass of the people were not represented at all ; it was only the landed interest and the corporations that sent knights of the shire, or burgesses, to Parliament. In this point of view there was no injustice in whatever disparity existed in the representation of different boroughs ; for it was not the *citizens* of Bristol, Hull, or St. Albans, but their *corporations*, that were represented : and, as one corporation stood to another in a relation of independence and equality, it was not unreasonable that two boroughs, differing widely in wealth and population, should choose an equal number of members of parliament : just as the several states of the Union, differing in the same way and degree, have each two Senators in Congress ; — the Senators representing not the people, but the States ; just as the burgesses represented not the people, but the corpora-

tions. Further, the boroughs themselves did not contain within their limits the whole population of the country, and so represent the whole people indirectly; nor, for the matter of that, were all the boroughs represented in Parliament, but only a certain number of them, designated by the caprice of the sovereign. Even assuming, therefore, that the citizen was represented in his borough,—as he certainly was in a degree,—it was very far from being a representation of the whole population; and at any rate there was no conscious effort at such a representation.

Some rude approach toward equal representation was made, no doubt, even in the earliest times. The boroughs were rudely classified according to population,—being entitled to a number of members proportioned to the respective number of inhabitants. But, in the main, no systematic attempt was made at equality; and, in proportion as the nation grew, and new interests sprang up, the inequality became more and more glaring. Side by side with this growth, the democratic idea came into being; and it began to be seen, although only partially and imperfectly, that the people were of right the source of power, and that representation legitimately belonged to the people *as forming the state*, not as associated into corporations. As a reluctant and partial concession to this feeling, the English Reform Bill was passed, by which the most obvious inequalities in the representation were done away. Like all half-way measures, this destroyed whatever symmetry and consistency there was in the original constitution of Parliament, without replacing it with a more just and philosophical scheme. The former representation had been purely of the corporations, with very slight regard to their relative importance. Now, it was admitted that it was the people that were to be represented. But the people were *not* represented,—only a portion of them,—and that with hardly more regard to equality than before. But the English do not easily suffer themselves to be disturbed by logical inconsistencies in political matters, provided the object aimed at is secured. In this case the object was, to save, by a compromise, just as much of the old system, as the new spirit of innovation, which

must be satisfied, would permit: so, by a clever adjustment, they retained the principle of representing corporations, but modified it in details in consonance with the principle of popular representation.

In this country, too, we began with the representation of corporations; and this is still the practice in regard to the Legislature of New Hampshire, and perhaps others of the New-England States. It has, however, been almost universally superseded by the system of artificial districts of equal population, — a very convenient system, and one of great apparent fairness: that the fairness is only in appearance is shown by the gross disproportion that almost always exists, between the total number of votes cast by the several parties in any state and the number of representatives they respectively elect. It is a political trick as old as the times of Governor Gerry, of Massachusetts, to lay out the districts with a special eye to gaining an unfair advantage in this respect; but, however honestly the division may be made, it is a matter of course that the minority in each district is unrepresented, so far as political opinions are concerned, and the minority may be — often is, as at present, in Iowa and Massachusetts — of the same political party in every district in the state. Further, it is obvious that there is a constant temptation, in a district made up of an aggregation of counties or towns, to pass the offices round from one town, or county, to another; each claiming in its turn the honor of furnishing the member. All this is to the advantage of local politicians, but not of the constituency or of the nation. It is notorious that leading members of congress are frequently lost to public life by some insignificant county putting in its claim; and there is no question that the General Court of Massachusetts has deteriorated in ability since the district system was substituted for the corporate system, in 1857. It seldom happens now in the small towns that an old member is sent a second time, as was the almost invariable rule formerly. Consequently, every year it is found that the Legislature is principally made up of new men; all the advantage gained by one year's experience being thrown away.

Indeed, with the abandonment of corporate representation, all motive for the representation of localities ceases. The *people* are the state — not the territory ; and it follows that the people, not their places of residence, should be represented. It is not possible for a man to represent, in any true sense of the term, the chance aggregation of individuals who are lumped together, by some gerrymandering process, into a district. They have no collective will, no identity of interests and associations, no common history, and no power of making one ; for, at the next decennial census, the whole will be rearranged. Whatever feelings of unity may have grown up will be uprooted, and a new set planted, to undergo the same fate in their turn. Corporate representation, however inconsistent with our democratic ideas, had, at least, a logical basis ; district representation has nothing but a shallow convenience, and a deceptive appearance of equality. Real equality it is not ; for nearly half the population of a state or city may be left wholly unrepresented.

It is certain, however, that — whether it is a gain or not — the American community has outgrown, or is fast outgrowing, the sentiment of corporate representation, and is fixed in the desire that representation should be proportioned to the population, or as nearly so as possible. But the district system cannot be regarded as any thing but transitional. It is well that the old system was abandoned ; because it would have been a great obstacle to the adoption of a just and equal method. The towns being now no longer represented, it is admitted that the people — being the only source of power — should be the only basis of representation. And the evils of the present order of things are so manifest, and the dissatisfaction with it is so general, that there is reason to believe that the people will listen with interest to a plan like that of Personal Representation, which promises a scientifically accurate method of securing this equality. For, as rude and cumbersome, as wasteful of force and meagre in results, as were the first steam-engines, in comparison with those which are now made ; so are the early attempts at representative government, — and indeed its present forms, — when considered

as a just and adequate representation of any given community.

The shape in which this principle has been brought most prominently before the public is, in Mr. Hare's elaborate scheme for the Representation of Minorities; all the details of which are considered by many persons as essential parts of the general plan. They therefore reject it without any careful examination, as being impracticable; and probably Mr. Hare's plan is so, at least in our American community. But the chief objections to it are in regard to points which are wholly immaterial to the principle itself: that is, the provision for indicating upon the voting-paper the successive choice of the voter, to take effect in case the first choice should not need to be counted; and, as a consequence, the necessity of some process of distributing the surplus votes. These provisions add, it is true, to the theoretical completeness of the plan, but must, we think, be too complicated for a community so impatient as ours.

Another plan has been suggested by the Personal-Representation Society of New York, and presented by them to the Constitutional Convention of the State. This plan wisely avoids the difficulty indicated above, by falling back upon the common American practice of plurality-choice. The inequalities in the number of votes it proposes to obviate by the novel plan of giving the members of the legislature a vote in proportion to the constituency which they represent. This feature has a show of justice; and if no questions were to come up before the legislative body except those already familiar to the voters at the time the election was held, it would be hard to find any valid argument against it, except that of its complication. For if, "in all divisions," it were necessary to foot up two long columns of figures, each of four places, it would be a tedious process, much delaying legislation. For instance, it would add infinitely to the ease of "filibustering," if every call for yeas and nays or a motion to adjourn were to be determined in this way. Probably, what is intended is, that the canvassing shall be done by hundreds, not by single votes; but even this would be a tedious process,

and it would be no doubt better, practically, to give each member one vote for every time he has received the necessary quota in the election. But, after all, it is a question whether even this would be just in the long-run. There are comparatively few questions on which members vote from purely party considerations; and these are the only ones on which a member may fairly be said to be acting as an agent for his constituents, carrying out what they had in mind when voting for him. In every thing beyond this, we must choose competent men, and be willing to feel confidence that they will govern well. In State and national affairs the people do little more than decide in favor of a particular line of policy; they do not rule, but choose their rulers.

Then there is Mr. Buckalew's plan, reported with favor by a committee of the United-States Senate; which allows each elector to cast as many votes as there are members to be elected, but to "cumulate" them, if he pleases, upon one or more candidates: thus a voter in this State might divide his thirty-one votes between two, three, or thirty candidates. Either this plan, or the simpler one of allowing each person to vote for only one candidate, but to be wholly untrammelled by considerations of locality, would promise decided reform. For, party-leaders — who are men of cunning, but of very little real ability — would be bewildered and helpless when the power of *forcing nominations* upon the community has been taken away from them; and men of a better type would be found ready to do the legitimate and useful preliminary work of recommending candidates to sections of the States, groups of towns or counties, in proportion to the strength of the parties. We do not care to discuss these plans in detail: on the whole we prefer the last mentioned; but any of them is better than the method under which we are now suffering.

We welcome, therefore, all such discussions as those in the essays before us. Some of the methods it proposes, have, we understand, been actually tried with good results: all of them, no doubt, would give a measure of relief. But we do not believe, however, that any essential and permanent

reform can be brought about, except by depriving the caucus itself of power. So long as the caucus is absolute in a party, so long it will be ruled by the most unscrupulous partisans, and any attempt to replace them by better men can be only partially successful. For overthrowing the power of the caucus, we know no way and have seen no method proposed, except that of Personal Representation. Under this system, the voter is fully protected against unfit nominations, such as now too often disgrace every party. For "bolting" — which is simply the protest of independent conviction against the arbitrary power of the majority — would then be no longer either useless or unpopular. It would be recognized as the right of every voter. Suppose, for instance, that in a given State a given party could reasonably expect, by virtue of its strength, to choose five members of congress. It could no longer venture to nominate partly unknown, and unworthy, men; if but one of the five were incompetent, enough voters of the party could agree among themselves to throw him overboard and unite upon a suitable candidate. Thus, the strength of the party would be preserved, and the individuality of the voters respected; while at the same time the caucus and convention would continue to possess all the power which legitimately belongs to them. So long as they exercised their functions with discretion and honesty, they would be followed; when they ceased to do this, their recommendations would be neglected.

It is true that Personal Representation can apply only in cases where a number of persons are to be chosen, especially in the case of legislative bodies. Governors and mayors must still be chosen, as now, by a pure majority vote. But it is in the legislative bodies that the trouble lies: whatever evils may now exist in the election of executive officers would be remedied by improving the character of the Legislatures. Once rid of the rule of small politicians, the people may fairly be left to take care of the rest. No plan, to be sure, will give us a perfect government, or remedy all abuses, so long as human nature is itself imperfect. But a reform in the

part will speedily react upon the whole ; and, if we can purify the sources of political action by making it no longer worth the while of greedy adventurers to make politics their profession, we need not fear but that larger concerns will be in good hands.

ART. III.—THE WORLD AND THE SOUL.

WE do not invite our readers to inspect any details of human prosperity and adversity, either from the material point of view or from the spiritual. We ask them to generalize the whole subject, and thus grapple, in its extremest dignity, with the problem of true profit and loss, or the world and the soul. In the case of all human beings, that problem lies forever between the sum of things and the individual self ; and every man, as fast as he lives, works out an experimental solution. Can any thing be more becoming to intelligent beings than also to work out a theoretical solution ? Thus alone can men learn to live by principle and not at mere random. Gain the world and lose the soul ; lose the world and save the soul ; lose both the world and the soul ; or gain them both,—one of these four must be done. Which of them shall it be ? In addition to the practical answers given by the different lives of men, let us endeavor to think out a rational answer.

The awful text, "What shall it profit a man if he shall gain the whole world and lose his own soul," has been thundered from the pulpits of Christendom for fifty generations. The mystic horror with which it has been loaded baffles description. Suggesting every form of fear and agony, magnified by the scale of their duration to a terrific incomprehensibility that crushes the very power of emotion, the doctrine it is thought to teach has been the theological incubus of the Christian conscience. To the degree in which it has been believed, that doctrine has sat on mankind for ages, clouding the sun above, darkening the earth below, radi-

ating anguish between. By its arbitrary standard of award, decreeing an infinite doom for a finite dereliction, it has depicted a flaming abyss of woe awaiting us, with no way of escape save by a forensic artifice that overthrows the principles of reason and morality. It has thus introduced a distressing contradiction into our natural estimates of merit and blame. This supposed opposition between divine revelation on one side, and human logic and sentiment on the other; this dread looking for the endless perdition of the soul in consequence of too great love for the world, — could not but be prolific in discord and misery. Vividly believing the doctrine, who could keep his mind in healthy poise before the appalling illustrations preachers have used to enforce it? — such illustrations as the supposition that if a little bird were once in a million centuries to carry a speck of earth in its bill to some distant star, until the whole globe was thus removed, even then, the victim, writhing in his dungeon of fire, would be no nearer to his release than he was at the beginning!

Although the encroachments of sounder thought have undermined the popular belief in the whole system of ideas on which this superstition rests, it yet has authority enough to make the lives of multitudes of Christians inconsistent and unhappy. So late as the year 1864, the celebrated English scholar and divine, John Henry Newman, made the following deliberate assertion. "It would be better for the sun and moon to drop from heaven, for the earth to fail, and for all the many millions on it to die of starvation, in extremest agony, than that one human being should commit a single venial sin, tell one wilful untruth, or steal one poor farthing." Such an absurd enormity of sentiment no scientific or healthy morality can tolerate for an instant. God evidently thinks differently from John Henry Newman, since he chooses to have myriads of sins constantly committed rather than destroy the great frame of nature. And what a piece of impious arrogance it is for any man thus coolly to assume that a hypothetical figment of his brain is preferable to the actual arrangements of the Omniscient God! The notion is a result of premises fur-

nished by morbid dreams of ignorance and superstition. It supposes that the petty folly or wrong of an instant deserves to be repaid in everlasting torture; that God will balance our momentary aberrations of sin with his motionless infinitude of wrath. But in truth it is a blank irrationality thus to take purely relative and evanescent things out of their relations, and match them with the absolute fixtures of the infinite. Anger, unforgivingness, prisons, fetters, scourges, — all such imagery is utterly inapplicable to God, disembodied souls, the free spaces of the immaterial world. A human spirit, after the death of the body, chained in a dungeon of flaming gloom, is a conception wholly incredible to any mind sufficiently informed and unprejudiced to command respect for its judgment. Henceforth, then, be the horrible conceit that the soul which loves the world too keenly must go to a hopeless hell after death, no more regarded. Let no such thing be suggested, but something very different, whenever again we hear those tremendous words, "What shall it profit a man if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul!"

Let that text suggest a truer idea. For if God never revengefully hurls us into a lake of brimstone, and then bars all exit, he does by regular methods of nature and grace uphold the unbroken sovereignty of his laws, and constantly bring into our experience the most solemn retributions of good and evil according to our deserts. Although endless condemnation to a torture-house be a fictitious horror; nevertheless, sin and virtue, loss and gain, salvation and perdition, are the supreme realities, of supreme moment to every one of us. It is these with which the impressive language of the text deals. Let us, therefore, for our guidance, try to pluck out the mystery of that language, and set its truth and its morals in a clear light.

First, then, in what sense can any man properly be said, even by a metaphor, to gain the whole world? Money is a symbol for all material goods. It is a talisman commanding the external means for the enjoyment of the uses of the earth. The millionaire of our time has a servant at his beck who more than realizes the wonders performed

by the slave of the lamp in the Arabian tale. What behest will not the genius of gold fulfil for its master, so far as the material conditions of gratification are concerned? It surrounds him with every luxury of art and society. It pours the fruits and fabrics of all climes into his lap. Without any violent figure of speech, such an one may be said to have gained the whole world; and all the preachers in Christendom may go on declaiming against his achievement, from now till the crack of doom, and never convince one sensible man that it is not — other things remaining the same — a magnificent blessing.

Furthermore: rank, honorable position, is a symbol for all the goods of society. He who has the prerogatives of social power in his hand, the honors of a nation at his feet, the control of its treasures, the appointment of its officers, the sway of its fleets and armies, intrusted to his keeping; who looks far around and sees no one in political place above him, but all underneath, looking up to him with obsequious service, — surely he may with emphasis be said to have gained the whole world; since the world contains nothing of public pomp, privilege, or pleasure, whose equivalent is not his. And this position, too, if rightly won and used, is a wonderful boon to hold. The desire for it is not to be condemned, but to be morally regulated.

There is another who, still more intimately and genuinely than either of the foregoing, gains the world. There is on the earth — God be thanked! — many a wise man, who, by the consecration of vast faculties to vast toils, has conquered the costly domains of human knowledge; mastered the treasures of history, science, philosophy, poetry, and religion; who, at will, sweeps the intellectual scale of humanity from end to end, in thought and feeling, subsidizing all its glorious resources; marshals the facts, understands the laws, reads the uses, sees the panoramas, recognizes the mysteries of the universe, all girdled in by the generalizations of his mighty imagination. Carrying as he does in his mind an incorruptible epitome of the outward creation, a spiritual picture and fruition of it, no one can deny that such a man has, in a

very striking sense, gained the whole world. The world is his, to contemplate in vision, to systematize in thought, to possess as boundless treasure indestructibly mixed with the fibres of his consciousness. Such a gain, so far from deserving to be despised or denounced, is a prize fit to fire a deathless ambition.

There remains still an additional final mode of gaining the whole world. It is by a sympathetic appropriation of all the use, sweetness, and glory of the world through an imaginative personal identification of ourselves with our fellow-beings, a disinterested enjoyment of the goods of other people as if they were our own. An unperturbed, generous, loving soul, free from pride, arrogance, or corruption, counts no grandeur of the creation, no honor or boon of society, no achievement or blessedness of humanity, as foreign to itself. By right of eminent domain its self-surrendered will traverses and ideally reaps the benefits of all. Its glad, pure sympathies are a private focus through which the public harmonies of the universe, the costly properties of life, play, and pay a tax of joy as they pass. Thus the soul has an indefeasible usufructuary possession of the whole world. And in exercising this dominion, so far from yielding to a fatal sin, it illustrates its choicest and richest estate as a child of God here below.

We have seen, then, that man may appear to gain the world by wealth, by power, by knowledge, or by guileless sympathy. And this gain is an imposing good unless, — heed well the qualification, — unless it be neutralized by connection with some sin which turns it into a curse.

The next step in our subject is to determine the meaning of the other clause of the text. Dismissing, as the fiction of a sick brain, the idea of an eternal local imprisonment of it in hell-fire, let us ask, In what sense is it possible for a man to lose his own soul?

A man possesses his soul when he has the unimpeded and noble use of its offices; when it properly occupies its material seat in peaceful and happy work and play. We need not be told that this often fails to be realized; and that where it has

once been gloriously experienced, it often ceases to be so experienced any more. The first case in which a man may be said to lose his own soul is when the use and enjoyment of it are taken away from him; when the action of his being is perverted from its normal blessedness into misery, the royal order of his faculties gone, the harmonies and pleasures of virtue and health swallowed up in friction, discord, and woe. Obviously, he is no longer the lordly delighter in his own soul. Consciousness is then wretchedness, and he is its victim. Disease has wrenched the throne from him; and until the pleasurable use of his nature is restored to him, no earthly gain, even if it be the world, can avail him any thing. What good is light to the blind, music to the deaf, motion to the paralyzed, love to the hater, logic to the irrational? Worthless the gift of the whole creation, except to a soul fitted to enjoy it.

Again: man may well be said to lose his own soul when he is degraded from the authority of a rightful self-rule, into any vile bondage against which his better nature vainly protests and struggles. He who lives,—as how many a poor wretch does!—in absolute subjection to some low passion, bridging over the intervals from indulgence to indulgence with complaining desires or with drugged insensibility, cannot be regarded as the master of his own soul. The crown of liberty has been plucked off, and his royal crest brought down to the dust. Conscience has been pitched out of its throne in chains, and some foul usurper has vaulted into the seat. In this odious slavery of appetite or rage, the drunkard, the sensualist, the murderer, has lost his own soul. It is not the collective faculties of his poised and authoritative mind that governs the province of his life and enjoys the revenue of its good. The tyrannical passion that holds him in its gripe crushes the counter-impulses of his nobler self; and, in the degradation of his bondage, he cannot say his soul is his own. It is not his. It belongs to the insane passion that domineers over him.

There is another mode, besides, by the perversion of its functions into misery, and by the debasement of its liberty

into slavery, — a deeper and darker mode, in which the soul may be lost, — that is, by the ruin of its substantial conditions, and the consequent destruction of its essential glory. In consequence of a disastrous hereditary transmission, or terrible exposures of disease, or abnormal habits of life, a gloomy mist may creep over the reason, a slimy stagnation settle on the imagination, decay with rotten fingers seize on the ethereal network of the brain, and insanity and imbecility come slowly down to close the sorrowful scene of the dis-crowned and idiotic king of the earth. Of all the dismal spectacles humanity exhibits, none is so ghastly sad as the sight of one thus surviving the loss of his own soul, — the moving corpse of what he was.

There remains still one more method of losing the soul ; I mean by the annihilation or smothering of its moral essence ; not the wreck of its physical organs, but the gradual degrading of its vital worth and splendor of prerogatives into dead mechanical repetitions and ruts. By a low and narrow monotony of selfish habits exclusively indulged, by a freezing, starving penuriousness of thought and feeling, a man may become, no longer a real man, but a niggardly machine for grinding out some single product ; for hoarding money or securing some other base gratification. He thus simply ceases to have a soul. Instead of being a free spirit, he sinks into a fixed instinct. We cannot say of him, as we do of any strikingly admirable specimen of our race, He is a whole soul ! He is only a vulgar fraction of a soul.

The genuine possession of the soul, then, is the free and firm holding of the prerogatives of liberty, wisdom, virtue, and happiness. The forfeiture of this high and holy rule in slavery, misery, madness, idiocy, or vulgar routine, is, in the most true and awful sense of the words, the loss of the soul. And with that loss every blessed light is darkened that guides us on our way. Therefore let no one fear lest, in discharging the text of the shocking doctrine hitherto associated with it, we leave it without a most sound and terrible sanction of its own ; a sanction a hundred-fold stronger than the other, because, while that was a theory, this is an experience ;

while that was an incredible fiction, this is an undeniable reality.

Now we have clearly before us all the data needed for answering the question, "What shall it profit a man if he shall gain the whole world and lose his own soul?" Difficult and portentous as the question appears, uncertain as multitudes are as to the answer they shall make, no one ought to hesitate an instant to give it this decisive reply: It shall profit him nothing at all; neither shall it injure him any; for it is not the gaining of the world, but some sin committed in the process of seeming to gain it, that causes the harm. A few examples of supposed world-gainers and soul-losers will render convincing proof of these statements and make the conclusion clear.

To gain the world, that is, to command all the uses of the material and moral creation around us, is precisely what God has made and put us here for. As princely children of the Infinite Sovereign, we are born and trained to be kings of the world, holding it tributary under our feet to yield us all its powers and joys. But when we suffer ourselves to become slaves of certain mere symbols of the world, instead of solidly mastering the world itself; when instead of really swaying our own proper sceptre we sink under the despotism of what has no right to command us,—then indeed there is a miserable confusion, a fatal perversion, and our souls are truly lost in foolishness and sin and retributive misery.

Damocles on the throne, eying the hair-hung sword that glittered tremulously over his head, found no profit in the kingdom with which he was invested; for he was the slave of terror, every capacity of enjoyment gone. Sardanapalus, Tiberius, a thousand other imperial slaves of sensuality, each plunged in his sty of debaucheries, self-disgusted, insufferably satiated and wearied, was a more pitiful object than the poorest day-laborer in his realm. The peace and purity of his soul gone, his body left by exhausted passions like the crater of an extinct volcano, made the possession of the world a profitless mockery. In fact he did not possess the world, only a hollow emblem of it. Napoleon, in yielding to his

insatiable ambition, became the slave of the exacting situation into which his genius raised him ; obliged incessantly to plot and counter-plot, to distrust and deceive, without one moment of sweet peace, one moment of ingenuous faith in men, one moment of innocent joy ; and when his eagle heart broke on the lone rock in the sea, the last cry of his despair might have been, "I fancied I had gained the whole world, but it has profited me nothing ! Wretched delusion, farewell !"

Coleridge, whose marvellous genius seemed intuitively to grasp the intellectual universe and use its contents at pleasure, fell under the dominion of opium. That accursed drug stole the natural man from his nature, unhinged and blasted his thrice-royal mind, devastated his life with an almighty blight, turned every friendly sympathy or appeal poured as oil into his wounds into oil of vitriol, and set a thousand ghosts gibbering after his remorseful steps, Aha, Son of the Morning, how art thou fallen with thy glorious schemes ! Thus the proud world-monarchy of his genius profited him nothing, because he did not keep his soul in tune, with duty as the key-note.

The topmost king among the nations to-day, who sees all the crowned heads of the earth ranged below his own, who has won his way to that dizzy eminence by all sorts of means, fair and foul, — especially by a transcendent ability to rule, — who sees the baseness and fickleness of the ungrateful crowds that eddy around the foot of the social fabric, who understands perfectly well the envious hate with which he is regarded, how fatal it would be to place any confidence in the selfish plotters around him, — with what eager relish, on any change of fortune, they would see him dragged through the streets like a dead dog, — so far as happiness and the choicest good of life are concerned, what a splendid bargain he would make if he could exchange conditions with a secluded, rich-souled poet, who, remote from the turmoil of politics, free from every galling passion, loves his fellow-men, enjoys the beauty of nature, adores his God, and leads a life as peaceful as a lily in a mountain-pond, as happy as a lark mounting from the dew to sing on the rosy edge of a cloud !

It is true that the prerogatives of the greatest positions give no sufficient compensations for what these terrible temptations, responsibilities, and devouring cares take away. And I verily believe, if the secrets of all hearts could be truly read by all men, far more would wish to come down from lofty seats than to climb up from lowly ones. And yet, let us not fall into the vulgar fallacy of underrating the prizes of wealth, power, and knowledge, nor into the more vulgar wrong of railing at them. Accurate discrimination is needed; for the exact truth alone is a safe guide. The enjoyment of the *uses* of the wealth of the rich, of the wisdom of the learned, of the authority of the powerful, of the love of the affectionate, of the devoutness of the pious, — this is the essential good, at bottom, really coveted by all; this is the genuine conquest of the world. If this be truly possessed, the outer symbols of it are unimportant. If these be not possessed, all those symbols — money, knowledge, position, fame, genius — are empty shadows or galling taunts. Surely, if we must choose between the two, it is better to be poor and happy than to be rich and miserable; ignorant and contented, than learned and repining; obscure and blessed, than illustrious and accursed. But it is best to be rich and happy, wise and contented, illustrious and blessed. Reconciliation of goods is superior to contradiction of goods. Better, infinitely better, lose the world and save the soul, than gain the world and lose the soul, if one must be elected. But, really, this is a false alternative. It is a sophistical antithesis, the result of careless and shallow thinking, which has confounded things often accidentally associated, but always intrinsically distinct. In the most absolute truth of the case, in the highest and deepest meaning of the thought, the asserted contradiction between the winning of the world and the saving of the soul is an impossibility. You must gain or lose both the world and the soul together. It is not possible for any man truly to do one alone. The proof of this proposition will form the fitting climax of this discussion, and yield the true moral of the subject.

A queen, full of grief and care, weary of the heartless round of pomp, sighed with envy as, looking from the palace win-

dow, she saw a milkmaid go by with her pail, blithely singing as she passed. At the same moment, the milkmaid, looking up at the gorgeous lady, enviously sighed, Ah, that I were the queen ! Now, in the truest sense of the words, neither of them had gained the whole world, though both had lost their own souls. That is to say, neither one commanded a rich fruition of the world in a peaceful enjoyment of her soul. The trouble lay not in the proud rank of the one, the world at her feet ; nor in the humble station, poverty and toil, of the other. The trouble lay in the fact that neither one had a contented spirit. To lose the soul, — that is, to be spiritually enslaved, tormented, idiotic, insane, or mechanized, — is to be also unable to enjoy the world. To save the soul, — that is, to perfect the rightful freedom of reason, the rightful supremacy of conscience, the rightful enjoyment of the functions of your being — is at the same time to possess, in the harmonious action of the soul, the noblest and sweetest use of the world. It is obvious, consequently, that the experience of gaining the world and saving the soul is a correlative process, of which one side necessarily implies the other. The miser, wretchedly gloating over his wealth, has not really gained the enjoyment of the world, only an idle emblem of it. Did he truly possess and improve the reality of it, the inevitable inference would be that his soul was saved.

The Christian, poor, suffering, exiled, but swaying the sceptre of conscience over all his lower powers, and trusting in God with serene submission, has not lost the world, only some of its baser pleasures. The truest and noblest empire of the world — the realm of virtue and faith — is pre-eminently his. I protest against the blasphemous shallowness of identifying all the worthlessness, all the sinfulness, all the wretchedness, all the transientness of experience, with the substance of the kingdom of time, and then crying with mock piety, Love not the world ! It is both wiser and more religious to consider the order of God's works, the benignity of God's ways, the solemnity of duty, the sweetness of friendship, the sublime loveliness of nature, all the delicious prizes of life, as the true substance of the world, and then call on

men to love it better. Those phrases of the New Testament which would seem to contradict this, in their real sense broadly taken, affirm it. They are loose, metaphorical expressions which have been mischievously perverted, exaggeratingly emphasized. It is certainly more philosophical and more devout to characterize that sum of things made by God which we call the world, from its intrinsic contents and divine design, — which must be good, — than from the *evil which happens to accompany it*. Therefore we may boldly say that the current precept, Hate the world as the foil of heaven, expresses a falsehood of superstition; but the opposite precept, Love the world as the prophetic forecourt of heaven, expresses the truth of a deeper religion.

Every appearance to the contrary of this view is a superficial delusion. For example, it was the overweening ambition of Alexander, and not the world he seemed to have already conquered, that made him weep for more. The trouble was in his unsaved soul, not in his gained world. Had he really subdued the world to his mental use and profit, by the moderating of his desires to his condition, he had been happy. But his Macedonian phalanx yielded no genuine conquest of the world for his soul, only an empty token of its outward subjection. His inordinate greed of vanity was the fatal bane of all the good it touched; but that good remained none the less good for those who could find it good.

There now lives a man, who, beginning his career as a penniless boy, at an early age had accumulated a fortune of millions. He then suddenly collapsed under a softening of the brain, and went to the insane asylum, a hopeless idiot, leaving a beautiful and beloved family to mourn for him in his princely home. It was not that he gained the unprofitable world, and it undid him; it was that the overwrought intensity with which he pursued a symbol of the world was a violation of the laws of his nature, and the penalty was the loss of both the whole world and his own soul. So, too, a mastery of the scholarship of mankind, a vision of the entire circle of science and philosophy from the centre of self to the nebulous ring of the Infinite, is a sublime privilege, an inde-

scribable dignity and joy, to one who trusts in the benignant spirit and beneficent order of the LIMITLESS UNKNOWN, surrounding all that he can know. And if one endowed with this stupendous vision be a morbid and shuddering doubter, distrusting the providence of God, filling the unknowable with frightful spectres, his impious distress is not the fault of his too much knowledge, but of his too little faith; not the retribution for what he has won, but for what he has failed to win. His exacting and rebellious self-will has vitiated his very wisdom: the discord of his soul has poisoned the world.

Thus it is seen, that, without the previous saving of the soul, there can be no true gaining of the world, but only of some hollow symbol of it; such as wealth, rank, or opinion. For the possession and use of the reality, or of any solid equivalent for the reality, a healthy and vigorous soul is indispensable. Thus the false opposition, so perniciously supposed between the world and the soul, is exploded by the affirmation of the true identity of their claims in the actual coalescence of their enjoyment. The true conception of a divinely fulfilled life, therefore, is the picture, not of an impoverished and ascetic soul opposed to a renounced and hostile world, but of a richly equipped and happy soul exercising its prerogatives over the contents of a tributary world expanded to the utmost limits of consciousness. The present state is no less truly a work and gift of God than the unseen one to which we look forward in eternity. By a healthy and devout keeping of the laws of God here, then, men should seek to cleanse, edify, and furnish their souls, fitting them for the conquest and enjoyment of the world which is to come, through a preliminary conquest and enjoyment of the world which now is. He makes an ennobling sacrifice who foregoes cheap and mean indulgences for high and costly achievements, abandoning inferior advantages for superior ones. But he commits an injurious error who puts a fancied contradiction between forms of good where no real contradiction exists. And the grandest thing a man can do, a feat which will immeasurably profit him as long as he has a being anywhere in the universe of God, is to gain the whole world and

save his own soul. Nor let any one deem this double work a contradictory one. It is but the two sides of the same reality. For the only substantial mastery or enjoyment of the outer creation, either in this world or in any other, consists in the development and freedom of the self-possessed spirit.

The whole gist of the subject as we have presented it, in contrast to the prevalent ecclesiastical treatment of it, may be condensed into one crucial instance. Here is a man of the liberal Christian school, without any belief in the essential formularies of theological Orthodoxy, who has gained the whole world by his vast fortune, his generous culture, and his high social position. He has gained it without violating the strictest integrity or in any way defiling himself in the process. Has he thereby lost his own soul? He has retained the frank, untainted affections of boyhood, adding to them the firm principle, the sober wisdom, and the experienced faith of manhood. The love of his mother, long since a saint in heaven, is a fountain of holy feeling in his breast. He has kept himself unspotted from the temptations and vices which have borne down so many around him. A lover of men, a pure patriot, a generous patron of whatever is worthy and needy, the track of his past sparkles with good acts, like a pavement of diamonds. Are the poor laborers of his adopted city suffering from the high rents charged for inconvenient, badly ventilated, and filthy houses? He appropriates millions of dollars to build for them the most excellent residences, which they shall inhabit at the lowest interest of the cost. Has a large portion of his native country been desolated by war, ignorance, and misfortune? He devotes millions more to redeem and uplift it by the best means of education and refinement. Is an illustrious servitor of science in ill-health and desirous of a change of scene and work? He fits him out from his private purse, on a scale which kings and proud nations have seldom rivalled, for an exploring expedition to a tropical clime. Are the children of the good physician who ministered to his parents, left in poverty? He pays their expenses through college. He founds academies, endows hospitals and other public charities, in a spirit as unostenta-

tious as the munificence is princely. The hidden good he does is not less than the known, his daily life a galaxy of benevolence strewn with starry deeds unnamed. Genial in friendship, steadfast in trial, unaffectedly devout before God, his beneficence haloing him with a noble glory in the sight of the community, the benedictions of those blessed by his innumerable kindnesses envelop him with an invisible incense of love and praise as he passes. As to his future fate, he leaves it with meek trust in the hands of his Maker.

Now will any bigot dare to say, "There is no hope for this man after death, because he is a Unitarian, denying the blood that bought him"? God himself, through the everlasting validity of his laws, everywhere in silent execution, declares that the gates of salvation shall never be shut against such a man. By the intrinsic fitness of his character, harmonized with the divine will, his heavenly destination is assured. Is it credible to any rational mind that a man of this stamp, because by his honest merits he has won the world, and by his magnanimous purity and liberality made a noble use of it, shall hereafter be condemned to hear the words, "Son, thou hadst thy good things in thy lifetime, and now thou must be tormented"? No: instead of being thrust down to perdition because of his meritorious triumph on the earth, he shall on that account be raised to a double height in heaven, with the five mortal talents gaining five immortal ones, and winning from the Master the sentence, "Well done, good and faithful servant! Thou hast been faithful over a few things; I will make thee ruler over many things. Enter thou into the joy of thy Lord."

The Orthodox, in the average of their laity, will no doubt indignantly deny that their belief dooms such a man to hell. But the logical necessities of their unrepudiated creeds do thus doom him. And that is the doctrine which has been, and still is, currently preached. Will they assert that a man can go to heaven without any belief in the Trinity, in the plenary authority of the Bible, or in the atoning blood of Christ? If so, then they are theists like us, their faith grounded on the great ethical postulates of natural religion.

They ought either consistently to stand by their theory of a dogmatic and sacramental salvation, or else manfully to abandon it. They have no right to the illicit advantage of holding two contradictory views at once, — vociferating, when in their own conventicles, the narrowest and most shocking terms of superstition and bigotry; claiming, when they address a more free and enlightened public, to believe only in flexible and rational conditions of redemption open for all men. They will see eye to eye with us when they outgrow the childish folly of believing only in a verbal God of tradition, cast in the metaphor of a fickle human monarch, and acquire faith in the living God of benignant and unchangeable law. To the Infinite, time and eternity are one; the soul and the world, the obverse and the reverse of a serial act; and judgment no critical climax or crash, but a continuous process. The true possession of our earthly environment and the salvation of our personality are therefore identical.

ART. IV. — IS THERE A CATHOLIC CHURCH IN AMERICA?

- I. *The Catholic History of North America*. Five Discourses, to which are added two Discourses on the Relations of Ireland and America. By THOMAS D'ARCY MCGEE, Author of the "Reformation in Ireland," &c. Boston: Patrick Donahoe. 1855. 12mo, pp. 239.
- II. *The Path which led a Protestant Lawyer to the Catholic Church*. By PETER H. BURNETT. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1860. 8vo, pp. 741.

"THE Catholic History of North America" was published several years ago, and did not then attract much attention in either Protestant or Catholic circles. It contains some good things, and on the whole it is not an unreadable book. The public papers and other documents given in the appendix have an historical value, and several of them are very

interesting. But the author's conclusions and anticipations are, to say the least, illogical and ridiculous.

"I have announced to the public," he says, "for some time that I am prepared to prove in these discourses three propositions; to wit, first, that the discovery and exploration of America were Catholic enterprises, undertaken by Catholics with Catholic motives, and carried out by Catholic co-operation."

Therefore, according to our author's logic, America belongs by right to the Catholics, or rather to the Irish, owing to the fact that *the Irish have contributed more than their share* to increase the Catholic population in the United States.

"In kind, as in quantity," he tells us, "this [Irish] emigration was materially more valuable than any the colonial times had known. Its uniform poverty was its most useful quality. . . . The German villagers, who march in compact procession from the ship's side to the far West, do better for themselves, but not for the country. A steady supply of cheap labor, a force which could be freely moved from point to point of national development, . . . was the great want of this republic in the last half-century; and that want Catholic Ireland supplied."

Does it not follow that, to make up for the moderate wages they received, the Irish should, at some future time, become the owners and rulers of the land?

The next proposition which the author is prepared to prove is, "that the only systematic attempts to civilize and Christianize the aborigines were made by Catholic missionaries." Therefore, in the opinion of the modest and truthful historian, the Catholic Church is certainly the oldest institution in America, as it is in Europe; and is alone entitled to rule American consciences as it does those of half the Christian world! How the preceding statements can be made to agree with the following is more than we would venture to say.

"The first Irish emigrants had failed to implant Catholicity in British North America. . . . In retired spots of Maryland and Pennsylvania, a few had the happiness never to be totally deprived of the sacraments; but the vast majority, in the absence of church and priest, had fallen insensibly away."

We must remember that, during all that time, from the English to the American Revolution, and, afterward, before the great Irish emigration commenced, there were many churches already established in America; Protestant churches existing previously to the establishment of the Catholic Church by the Irish.

After having thus endeavored to prove that the Catholic is the oldest church in America, the lecturer proceeds to prove, thirdly, —

“That the independence of the United States was, in a great degree, established by Catholic blood, talent, and treasure.”

And therefore who can deny the Catholic Church the right of controlling American affairs, of assimilating to itself American institutions, and of alone possessing the American continent? The confidence of our author is so great, and the trust he puts in his own assertions so boundless, that at the very start, as if carried away by his faith in the “manifest destiny” of Catholicism in this country, he exclaims, —

“If I succeed in establishing these three propositions, as I believe I shall succeed, may we not hope that the offensive tone of toleration and superiority so common with sectarians will be hereafter abated; that more merit will be allowed to the ages before Protestantism, which produced all the oceanic discoveries; that a more respectful style may be used in speaking of Spain and Italy, — the two arms of European civilization first extended to draw in and embrace America?”

Next, a few words about the “Path which led a Protestant Lawyer to the Catholic Church.”

A very tortuous, dark, and dangerous path it must have been, since a bulky volume of more than seven hundred octavo pages was necessary to describe it. Neither the learning nor the ingenuity of a lawyer has been sufficient to give us such a description of it as to make us understand where it lies, or what country it passes through, or from what place it starts. The traveller seems to have set out rather late in the evening, and, after wandering a few hours through the darkness, to have got so bewildered that he

sought shelter in a Catholic Church which happened to be open. It was Christmas night. The midnight mass was just going on, and the whole performance deeply affected the wearied lawyer. .

"He had never witnessed any thing like it before; and the profound solemnity of the services, the intense yet calm fervor of the worshippers, the great and marked differences between the two forms of worship, and the instantaneous reflection that this was the church *claiming* to be the *only* true church, did make the deepest impression upon *his* mind for the moment."

He gazed into the faces of the worshippers, and they appeared to him as if they were actually looking at the Lord Jesus, and were hushed into perfect stillness in his awful presence. That was the beginning. From that moment the "path" was fairly open before him. He entered upon it, and, as we think, got lost. Surely, it is not always safe to travel during the night, especially through unknown countries, without any other light than a wax taper. The book is a repetition of all those arguments which are generally urged by Catholic writers in support of their own faith. It is written with great calmness and moderation, nor is a single word met with that evinces the least bitter feeling against any one. In this respect it is truly a model book. The writer merely adduces, though in a very complicated manner, the arguments that have convinced himself, in the hope that they may produce on others the same effect. The work is evidently intended for Protestant readers. All expressions are carefully avoided that might give offence, and the most objectionable points are presented in their most plausible and pleasant aspect. Occasionally, the whole Catholic doctrine is not unfolded; that portion only being exhibited to which scarcely any Protestant would object. Catholic theologians usually reckon the opinions of the ancient Fathers as authoritative on matters of faith. According to our author, it is their testimony alone the Church accepts on matters of fact; to wit, *What were the doctrines held, and the observances kept by the Church in their day?* We can hardly believe this book was

written without the aid of some person more versed in the doctrines of the Romish Church, and more used to theological reasoning, than a man of mere legal education can reasonably be supposed to be. It evinces such a knowledge of ecclesiastical writers, and such a skill to make the best of every argument, as Mr. Burnett's "eighteen months' investigation, occupying all his spare time," could not possibly have given him. A friend who is versed in these matters once assured us that works written by competent writers are often published under the name of some influential layman by Catholic priests. May not the one before us be of that description? Be this as it may, the "Path which led a Protestant Lawyer to the Catholic Church" is thrice as long as it should be. Let us hope that when any other lawyers go over to the Catholic Church, they may take a less intricate road, and edify us by a shorter account of their journey.

We said "the *Catholic Church*." But we are by no means sure such a church exists, at least in this country. A church can be Catholic only in one of two ways. Either by professing principles adapted to all men, to all times, and to all places, and receiving into its bosom every one without regard to speculative opinions; or by continuing in the faith and practice of such churches as are by universal consent called catholic. The idea of any church being catholic merely because it actually exists everywhere is preposterous. Even if there were such an institution, mere ubiquity would not entitle it to that glorious designation. Vice in all its most abominable forms can be found everywhere: who ever thought of calling vice catholic? It is true the word originally means universal; but it was adopted into modern languages in a restricted signification, with reference to Christian principles and doctrines, or to the peculiar forms and usages of a Christian church. It is in this sense we understand it when we ask, "Is there a Catholic Church in America?" In the beginning of the Christian era, when humility was regarded as an essential characteristic of religious life, no particular body of men, professing to follow the doctrine and the example of the humble Jesus, exclusively claimed for them-

selves the right of being called "the Catholic Church." Every association of Christians, whether worshipping in a private house or in a public temple; every denomination of disciples, whether saying "We are of Paul" or "We are of Apollos;" every Church of Christ, whether in Jerusalem or in Rome, whether governed by James or by Peter, — all, without exception, considered themselves bound to live up to their profession, in the cherished hope of being acknowledged as members of the one invisible holy Catholic Church by the Supreme Shepherd Christ Jesus. Though they often differed in opinion on most important points, and some were more faithful than others; though certain doctrines, as taught by some, were by others rejected as heresies, — the notion of any one alone being, or having a particular claim to be called, Catholic, was never entertained. Only later, after Christ's spirit had left those ecclesiastical bodies; when divine charity was no longer the bond of union between the churches; when Greek subtilities and pagan speculations were substituted for the simplicity of the gospel, — then only were pretensions made to supremacy and infallibility, to apostolic descent and catholicity. Christian unity and union thus ceased for ever, and with them the sole conditions that could really entitle the Church of Christ to the honor of being truly in a spiritual sense catholic. This happened about the middle of the fourth century. After the church spirit had become sectarian, men established the necessity of believing in the visible "Catholic Church." No article of faith concerning catholicity of any kind can be found in creeds anterior to the celebrated "Arian Controversy." For more than three centuries Christianity had been steadily doing its blessed work of reformation among the nations that received it, and no one had ever thought of compelling all its professors into a single church to be confessed catholic under penalty of eternal condemnation. The idea of a visible universal organization, governed after the system of a temporal kingdom, is so utterly averse to the nature of true religion, that no greater objection could be made to Christianity, were it true that Christianity requires it. What is a help to one is a hindrance to another, and abso-

lute freedom is necessary to the soul in her aspirations towards God. Religion alone, being necessary to man, is necessarily one and catholic. The churches must, on the contrary, be many and local; for the simple reason that they are temporary means, subject to modification and change, which must cease as soon as the object of their institution is attained. Nor can any of them be adapted to the spiritual wants and to the character of all men. They are associations demanded by human experience to foster brotherly love, and communicate to the individual the moral strength of the multitude; but they are not necessarily a part of the religious system taught by Jesus. The church he intended to establish is no visible organization. It is the gathering of all men into a spiritual family; it is their union with God through faith and love. As long as his disciples kept this great object in view, they were one in mind, though belonging to different places and churches: when they changed that object for the devices of human ambition, confusion followed, and dissensions without number. Like the people spoken of in the biblical allegory, they said to one another, "Let us make ourselves a name, lest we be scattered upon the face of the whole earth." God came down and confounded their language, and they can no longer understand one another. A return to the original simplicity, and to the independence of each individual body of Christians, might restore that harmony in the Church which was destroyed by a foolish attempt to become catholic.

The name, however, was preserved. In the eleventh century, the two largest sections of the Church, the Greek and the Latin, arrogated each to itself the distinctive appellation of Catholic,—each utterly denying it to the other. From that time, both these two great bodies of Christians have so far lost the consciousness of their dignity, and the knowledge of their holy mission, as to make Christianity entirely subservient to human ambition, and degrade it into an instrument of oppression. Who can read their history, and not feel at once grieved and ashamed when thinking of the means they have constantly used to up-

hold their doctrines, and triumph over their opponents? There is scarcely an article in their creeds that has not caused more bloodshed than the most sanguinary war. The ignorance and inactivity of the Greek priesthood is now proverbial: indeed, the whole of that Church is at the present time, and has been for the last five or six centuries, in a spiritual apathy, very near death. The Latin Church is living and vigorous; if it decays in one place, it grows in another. But, though by far the largest in the number of its members, as well as the most widely spread institution ever known, its spirit is very exclusive, and its principles very illiberal. Notwithstanding all this, the Greek and the Latin are the only two churches to which the designation of Catholic has not been denied; and we are far from denying it to any church in America that is a branch or integral part of either. Indeed, it is only in this peculiar sense that a religious denomination can lay any claim to catholicity; for, as we have already observed, no visible organization can be catholic, in the true sense of the word. As for its primitive and spiritual signification having particular reference to principles and practice, the term no longer applies to any Christian denomination, either in America or elsewhere. Nor are there, we think, many of our churches that would battle for a distinction, which has long since become a byword to all the good, in every country and amongst all religious professions. The Episcopal sect is occasionally styled "The Church" by its friends, and sometimes lays claims to catholicity. But those claims have so weak a foundation, that we merely mention the fact as a curious instance of human weakness and self-conceit. Episcopal writers affirm that their Church teaches the same principles, and professes the same faith, with the one Catholic and Apostolic Church of the first four centuries after Christ. By comparing her Thirty-nine Articles with the Creeds of Christendom, during that age, any one may satisfy himself whether this assertion is true. Let it be granted, however: what then? Was the Church, in the third and fourth centuries, the same in regard to faith and practice, that it was through the first and second? Were not the

anti-apostolic doctrines, which now dishonor the Christian name, introduced precisely at the time when the Church began to call itself Catholic? Where was the notion obtained that a true church must be the same with that of the first four centuries? If the practice of establishing arbitrary rules, and drawing from them consequences favorable to an institution, were admitted as legitimate, it would be impossible to distinguish between what is to be approved, and what should be rejected. There is no religious sect which, according to its own principles, is not superior to all others. Consistency, in such cases, cannot be received as an argument for truth and right, any more than the flattest contradiction. When it can be proved that a Church must be the same with the Church of the first four centuries, in order to be the true and catholic one; when it can be proved that the Episcopal denomination, such as it exists in this country, really fulfils that all-important condition, then there will be no longer any doubt about its being, "The One, Holy, Catholic Church" of this continent. Meanwhile, we can but stand by our proposition: If a Catholic Church exists in America, it must needs be either the Latin or the Greek. And, as no Church pretends to any connection with the latter, our inquiry is reduced to this: "Is there a Latin, or Roman Church in the United States?"

Certainly, there is a religious sect which claims to be the same as the Roman Church, and styles itself "One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic," after the fashion of the Church of Rome. It uses the Latin language in the performance of ecclesiastical ceremonies; it acknowledges the Pope as its visible supreme Head, and receives the Pope's Creed as its own creed and rule of faith. But, still we may ask, is that sect *one and the same thing* with the Roman Catholic Church? Does it really hold the same views, and profess the same principles? Is not its apparent submission to the bishop of Rome a mere pretext of its priesthood, in order to acquire in America the influence and power exerted by the Pope over Catholic Europe? Were we to judge from what is preached and published in this country by American "Catholics," we

should be compelled to say that their claims, even to such catholicity as that of Rome, stand on very slippery ground; that both their doctrines and their practice are in very important points at variance with those of the Latin Church. Let us take, for instance, the fundamental doctrine, the most important in the papal system, that of the Infallibility of the Church. The manner in which it is publicly taught and explained here would, we have reason to believe, subject to the mercy of the Inquisition whoever should dare to do the same in Rome. Dr. Daniel William Cahill's celebrated discourse, in whose praise so much has been written by Catholic editors and correspondents of newspapers, would not be tolerated in St. John Lateran, any more than a sermon from Luther or Calvin. Indeed, it is difficult to say which is more predominant in that remarkable production,—the arrogance of the priest, or the ignorance of the man; ignorance of every elementary principle of Roman Catholic theology, ignorance of which the meanest candle-snuffer of the Sistine Chapel would feel ashamed. According to the Irish divine, it is not only to the Pope teaching *ex cathedra*, or the Church assembled in *Œcumenico Concilio*, that infallibility belongs; but to every bishop, priest, or deacon, that may choose to speak from the pulpit in the name of the Almighty. "If God can deceive you," he says to his audience, "I can; nay, even in such case, I cannot;" and the blasphemy is applauded, called burning eloquence, and circulated in religious periodicals. Many a strange thing have we read in the works of Catholic writers, but we never saw the doctrine of Church infallibility carried so far. The Protestant principle of private and individual interpretation, with which we are reproached as the very worst of our capital sins, is absolutely nothing compared with it. "All priests are kings," says the Church of Rome, on the authority of Peter's "*Βασιλεὺς ἱεράτευμα*:" more than that, answers our doctor; they are infallible popes. There is another doctrine taught in America, which, we feel quite confident, is not the doctrine of the Roman Church, if her standard works can be relied upon as good authority in this matter. Corrupted as she is supposed to be, we do not

think she ever taught that *Disobedience to the laws of the Church evinces greater malice and depravity than disobedience to the law of God*. This maxim often occurs in American Catholic publications without meeting with the deserved rebuke, or even being noticed as an opinion in any way contrary to sound moral principles. It was once openly defended by one of the leading Catholic papers, and urged against Dr. Brownson in consequence of some very just and sensible remarks he had made in his "Review" on the character of the Irish people. The doctor ought to know, observed the writer, that the greater repugnance to violate a prescription of the Church, than a commandment of God, is a most noble trait in the Irish character; and it shows how deeply the reverence for that divine institution is rooted in their hearts.

These, however, are not our principal reasons for doubting the identity of the American and Roman Catholic Churches.

The Catholic clergy in this country reject with indignation the charge of not admitting the principles upon which our civil and political institutions stand, and of not recognizing, as belonging to all men those rights which we believe to be man's natural inheritance. Now, nothing is more certain than the fact that those very principles are condemned, and those very rights denied, by the Roman Church. Not to say any thing of the fundamental principles and well-known tendency of the papal system, the most explicit declarations and anathemas against them have proceeded from the Vatican. The sovereignty of the people; the legitimacy of revolution against oppression; the right of self-government; the freedom of conscience, of speech, and of the press; the inalienable individual right to liberty, knowledge, life, and the pursuit of happiness: all and single, at different times, have repeatedly been denounced as "scandalous doctrines, diabolical principles, infernal inventions, — blasphemous towards God, adverse to religion, insulting to the Church, subversive of order, offensive to pious ears, and leading men to dishonor and destruction." As such they have been condemned and anathematized, especially by Pius VII., Leo X., Gregory

XVI., and more lately by the "amiable and meek" Pius IX., who was not very fastidious in the choice of his terms to that effect. Shall we say that there are two measures, and two scales, by which what is wicked and damnable in Europe becomes good and praiseworthy in America? But even that miserable subterfuge is not left. The Popes unanimously declare that no one can follow such doctrines without forfeiting his title to the heavenly glory; and call upon all men, all over the world, — whatever their age or condition, their rank or dignity may be, — to disown, condemn, and anathematize those and other like principles, together with every one who teaches, approves, or connives at them, denouncing and delivering him to the competent tribunals, to be dealt with as is customary in such cases, notwithstanding the privileges and exemptions he may enjoy by birth or law, even though the privileges and exemptions had been granted by the Holy See, — under penalty of excommunication, *latae sententiæ*, to be incurred *ipso facto*, without any other declaration, and of the indignation of the blessed Apostles Peter and Paul. The Bulls are peremptory, sweeping, excluding no one under heaven. We confess we are unable to see how American Catholics can avoid or answer this dilemma. Do they agree with the Roman Church in her condemnation? Then they lie to the Church and their country when they affirm the contrary. Do they, in fact, receive those republican principles, lending a deaf ear to the Church of Rome? Then they are not one with her in doctrine and practice, any more than all Protestant churches are. No mental reservation can avail to extricate them from this position, or justify their conduct in either case. Either they are with us, and against the Roman Church: or they are with the Roman Church, and against us. The solemn oath of allegiance to the United-States Constitution, which they take in common with all our citizens of foreign birth, inclines us to believe them sincere in their professions of attachment to American principles and institutions.

In saying this, it is not our intention to insinuate that they play a double game, and must necessarily betray either party.

Similar inconsistencies are not uncommon. It is fortunate for society that men do not always act strictly according to the principles they profess to believe. The human heart often knows better than the human brain; and men are apt to follow the dictates of their affection in preference to the devices or suggestions of their understanding. Our only purpose is to state the reasons which have led us to think that the Catholic denomination in America has very little in common with the Papal Church, in regard to certain essential points of doctrine and practice. Her members may not be aware of it; they may honestly entertain the conviction that they are both good American citizens and faithful Roman Catholics. Laymen, particularly, who seldom meddle with and know little of ecclesiastical opinions, have the impression that all theology is contained in the Apostles' Creed, which they find is everywhere the same. The confession and the mass are for the great majority the whole sum of ecclesiastical practices for which they care; and, with regard to foreigners, their attachment in many cases to the Church is, we suspect, rather homage paid to an ancient institution of their native countries, than a clear sense of conscientious duty to the Almighty. American institutions are too great a blessing to them, to allow a preference for any other. The following facts are nevertheless deserving of consideration, as calculated to show that at least a large proportion of them have a vague feeling of their real position, although they may be unable to define it.

What we here in America call "the Catholic Church," is chiefly composed of foreigners from different nations; a comparatively small number only being of American descent. Not less than one-half of these foreigners are from Ireland; and, owing to the fact that the French and Germans do not allow themselves to be so easily priest-ridden, it is almost exclusively to the Irish that the interest in the Church is confined. Other foreign Catholics attend the mass, and have their children baptized by a priest, especially if married to Catholic women. If a priest of their own nation and tongue happens to minister to a parish, they contribute as far as

they can to his support in their usual way. But, as they have the impression that on the whole the institution is rather Irish than Roman Catholic, they keep aloof, and constantly refuse to join in the religious solemnities peculiar to that people. The reader may often have heard, as we often have, Irish persons say that other Catholics are not so good as the Irish; that the Irish are the most faithful Catholics in the world. Here, then, there are two facts which certainly are not without meaning. On one side are the Catholics from the European continent refusing to be assimilated with the Irish Catholics, and, in many instances, preferring to worship alone as independent societies, rather than commune with them in ecclesiastical matters. On the other, the Irish Catholics monopolize through their priests the government of the Church, under the pretence of being, as a nation, alone true Catholics, and with the conviction that God has constituted them the lords of this land. Now what does this mean? Can several millions of men be mistaken in judging of those things that stand nearest to their hearts, as the religious institutions under which they were educated undoubtedly do? No: the Germans, the French, the Spaniards, the Italians, all equally believe and feel that if there is an American *Catholic Church*, it must be, in doctrine as well as in practice, in her ritual as well as in her prescriptions, *one* and the same with that of their native countries. So much the more so, as it is necessarily formed of elements gathered from all nations of the earth. No other idea of Catholicism can they conceive; and, not seeing it realized in the Church pointed out to them as the only Catholic Church, they refuse to acknowledge it. In their turn, the Irish also are right. Their religious belief, their moral principles, their ecclesiastical practices, practically and essentially differ from those of other European nations; and as they do not perceive that others do what *they* do, they very naturally conclude that the Irish are the best, if not the only, Catholics in the world.

It may be objected that the Roman Catholic Church never claimed to be *one* in so strict a sense. Uniformity in doctrine, and submission to the Pope, are the only requisites,

properly speaking, that constitute her character, and the only essential conditions for any church of communion with her. Every church has, and is allowed to follow, her own usages; and, in several instances, a difference in ritual and language is even permitted. Nay, it is a duty for such churches to observe their particular forms, and use the prescribed tongue, which they in no case whatever can change without a permission from the Supreme Pontiff. This permission is only granted when the *greater* good of the Church universal evidently requires it. This condescension, this adaptation of herself to the habits, manners, and laws of the various countries where her children happen to be found, is in conformity with her catholic spirit. If all the members of Christ's body are united to the same visible Head, and profess the same dogmas, it matters but little how they move, how they manifest their submission and show their faith, provided they do so with the sanction of the Church. This *Variety in Unity* constitutes one of the greatest glories of which she can boast. These, and other like things, might be objected. But such objections do not apply to this case. The question is not whether the Coptic or the Greek branches of the Catholic Church have any title to be considered as such; but whether what is called the Catholic Church in America is really one with that of the continent of Europe, which alone is known as the Latin Catholic Church. It does not claim to be an American branch, or to follow the Ambrosian rite: it claims to be the Latin or Roman Church, and to follow the corresponding ritual. If Roman, why does not her teaching agree with that of Rome? If she observes the Latin rite, why cannot Catholics recognize what they have been used to from their childhood? Is it not rather an Irish Church, than an American Catholic one? Has not the original American Catholic Church, founded mostly by French and English missionaries, been supplanted by an institution which is to all purposes Irish and anti-American? Is the affected love and subjection of that institution to the Bishop of Rome a valid title to absorb into itself all other Catholics, because of its numerical superiority?

Is it not rather a specious pretence to obtain an influence which otherwise it would be foolish to hope for?

A satisfactory answer to all these queries may be difficult, may be impossible. But surely a few more years will show that the Pope is rather an instrument than a cause; that he is as ignorant of what is done in his name in this country, as we are of the plans to be executed by the *Catholic Church*. The spirit and aim of the two institutions are the same. What one has already done, the other intends to do. But the sins of the daughter, though often a consequence of the mother's example, do not always turn to the benefit of the mother. Besides, the Pope at the present time has so much to do in watching his own interests at home, that he may be very willing to abandon the Church abroad to the care of others, and be satisfied with several millions of dollars to pay the enormous, ever-increasing debt of his wretched State.

ART. V. — THE CHINESE QUESTION.

WE may at last feel assured that the negro question is practically settled, and can no longer afford a legitimate bone of contention for our great political parties.

Many fondly flatter themselves that now the winds of political dispute must cease. Others, less confident, wonder vaguely if there can be any longer any thing for the country to quarrel about and divide upon. The politicians, fearful of losing their occupation, are taking up every semblance of a question, and blowing the empty bubbles in hopes of puffing them into "issues." Eight Hour laws and Women's Rights, Free Trade and Cuban Independence, Catholicism and Temperance, coal and cotton, are all eagerly drummed into the political field, and their meagre ranks made to raise as much dust as possible, in order to delude people into thinking them the embattled hosts of great armies. But, meanwhile, there has arisen, just above the horizon, a cloud that is a real one;

a most serious and vital subject of dispute and honest difference, threatening to cover every thing else from view, and effect a complete reorganization of parties. This is the Chinese question.

We have heard something of the Chinese in California for several years. But they have been so distant, and communication with the Pacific coast has had such obstacles, that we have not concerned ourselves much about them. But the Pacific railroad has made a great change in our relations with that part of our country. It has brought San Francisco within a week's journey of New York. It gives an immense impetus to the commerce and communication between our country and China. The Chinese have been employed in large numbers in the building of that great highway, and their efficiency as laborers has been published throughout the whole country. Some of the Chinese have already arrived at Chicago; and an immigration company has been formed in that city, which has contracted for the importation thither of fifty thousand. A convention of agriculturists from all the Southern States was held at Memphis on the 13th of July, at which it was determined to organize a Chinese immigration company for the South immediately, with a capital of a million dollars. The general introduction of the Chinese into all the Southern States is intended. The Southerners hail John Chinaman as the "coming man;" an industrious, submissive, reliable, and cheap laborer, to take the place of the uncertain supply of the hated freedmen.

The number of the Chinese that are already in the country is much larger than is generally supposed. The six great Chinese companies, to one or the other of whom most of the Chinese on the Pacific coast belong, have record of 65,000. The whole number is thought by good observers not to fall short of 100,000. According to this estimate, one in every four of all the adults on the Pacific slope is a Chinaman. Every town of that section of the country, from the gulf of California to Vancouver's Island, and from the Golden Gate to the Rocky Mountains, has its Chinese quarter. The immigration is swelling with immense velocity. Every immigrant

that comes will bring a hundred others, just as fast as word can return from him to his brethren at home of the ease and rapidity with which money can be made here, and as fast as Americans learn the excellence and cheapness of the labor which the Chinese can supply. A Chinaman will pursue a few "sapecks" to the uttermost parts of the globe as devotedly as an American will a dollar; and wherever our employers try Chinese labor, they find not only that they can obtain it at a price much less than other labor, but that it is also more steady and careful, and that it is capable of carrying on almost any occupation or manufacture in which it may be wanted. The Chinese in California have found their way into almost every manual employment. They grade railways, open roads, cut wood, and pick fruit. They tend cattle and sheep, and wash and iron clothes. They run sewing-machines, and weave cloth. They make first-class factory operatives, being preferred to any other kind by the superintendents of cotton and woollen mills in California. They act as firemen to steamers and stationary engines, paint carriages, repair furniture, make boots, shoes, and cigars. They make tin and wooden ware, paper bags and boxes, and label and pack medicines. Placer mining has, from the first, been one of their chief occupations. They tend vineyards, and cultivate market-gardens. Their patient care produces the finest vegetables for the Sacramento and San Francisco markets. They have become especially useful and expert in domestic service as cooks, lackeys, and men-of-all-work in the house, filling completely the place of servant-girls. They are anxious to learn every thing that can be of pecuniary advantage to them, and their patience and imitative faculty enable them to do so with surprising celerity.

The field and demand for the labor of the Chinese would therefore seem to be immense. The supply is unlimited, as China, from her swarming population of four hundred million, could spare us ten or twenty million a year, without parting with any but the surplus increase of her people; and the immigration companies are doing their best to bring supply and demand together. The Pacific may be six thousand

miles wide, and the Atlantic coast three thousand miles from the Pacific; but to the steamship or the locomotive this distance is no more than the crossing of the Atlantic to a packet. In six years we shall probably have four or five hundred thousand of the natives of the Celestial Empire among us. In a dozen years they will amount to one or two millions. The cities of the Atlantic coast, as well as of the Pacific, will each have their China town or "*little China*." Yellow hands, instead of black, will hoe the rice and pick the cotton in our Southern States. They will crowd out the negroes from the tobacco-fields, the Germans from the market-gardens, and the Irish from the kitchens and factories, as these have already crowded out the native American. They will lower permanently the rates of wages. Their votes will soon be sought by one or the other of our political parties, and they will be naturalized and brought to the polls by tens of thousands.

Such is the situation which we shall soon be in, if the Chinese immigration goes on in its natural course without governmental interruption. Though the cloud appears yet but little larger than a man's hand, it is soon to cover the whole sky. Is it a cloud that brings copious, gentle, and enriching showers to our huge unpopulated wastes, or does it bring upon us destructive floods and all the floating *débris* of a ruined country? Will this cheap labor be a real advantage to the country, or a delusive one? Will the influx of the Chinese improve, or degrade and disturb our social and political condition? Shall their immigration be permitted, encouraged, or stopped? If allowed to enter the country, shall they be admitted to the protection of the laws, and the rights of citizenship and suffrage? These are important questions which we must very soon decide, or find the Chinese element and influence, like that of the Irish and German, become already so strong that we have no longer the control of it.

The question with all its attendants and conditions is so new that it would be presumptuous at present to give an unhesitating and final answer in regard to it. But there are some of the points that will have weight in forming our conclusion, upon which it is possible to speak with a good deal of certainty.

The first point in the problem is the industrial question. As the Chinaman will work for much less than the native laborer or the European immigrant, living, as he does, so economically that he will lay up money on wages on which an American would starve, and as he is at the same time a much more steady, easily-managed, and industrious workman, he at once supersedes the white laborer, and lowers the standard of wages wherever he goes. This is called by many an injury to the country. Of course, they say it is an immediate benefit to the capitalist and the employer; but it throws many of our native laborers out of employment and reduces them to poverty; and this lowering of the rate of wages lowers the standard of living and comforts of the whole laboring class of the country. It makes the rich richer, and the poor poorer. It removes the intelligent, well-paid American laborer, who was formerly the boast of our country, to fill his place with the ignorant foreign pauper.

This view is certainly plausibly presented, but we do not think it sound. The ability of the Chinese to labor so cheaply is not owing to their more degraded mode of living, but to their carefulness and thrift. In neatness, cleanliness, and comfort of living, they will equal if not surpass the Irish whom they supersede, although the Irish may have received much larger wages than they. If by the lowering of wages, and contact with the Chinese, our white laborers would learn to live with Chinese economy, it would be an inestimable benefit to themselves and the whole country. Cheap labor produces low prices for every thing. Low prices will relieve our commerce and manufactures from the depression and stagnation in which our present high prices keep them, and will enable the pursuit of them to become once more profitable; business will revive all over the country; production will be increased; the demand for labor will be greatly multiplied.

The low prices produced by cheap labor will bring down the cost of living, and will add just so much to the purchasing power of a man's money. The laborer himself, therefore, will get the original reduction of his wages made up, to a large extent, by this increase in the value of his wages; and,

as the number of consumers of the products of labor is much larger than the number of the producers, the number of persons in the whole community benefited by cheap labor must exceed in number those injured by it. To professional men, salaried men, clerks, people with fixed incomes, employers, and others not engaged in rude kinds of manual work, — and in this class would come the great majority of native Americans, — the reduction in the wages of manual labor, and the consequent lowering of the prices of all things, would be an unalloyed gain, a direct increase of their incomes. This comparative increase of the rewards of intelligent labor, and diminution of those of manual and unskilled labor, is most certainly a proper, just, and desirable result. If we are to maintain a high civilization in this country, the premium of intelligent labor over unintelligent must in some way be made much more considerable than at present.

Cheap labor, as we have said, will invigorate and enlarge the business of the country. It will thus increase the demand for labor. Its action will be like that of machinery in manufacturing. As the introduction of that was thought at first sure to throw a large portion of the laboring class *out* of employment, but was found afterwards to increase the demand for labor, at the same time that it reduced the cost of articles of manufacture; so it will be with the introduction of cheap labor. Our native laborers, instead of being crowded *out* by the introduction of the cheap Chinese labor, will be crowded *up* into the grade of overseers, superintendents, employers, storekeepers, clerks, and so forth. A well-paid American laborer is, doubtless, an honor to the country; but when he becomes a better paid overseer or employer, does he become less honorable or more?

As a general thing, however, the fact is that there are no longer any native American laborers to be crowded out. They were crowded out some time ago in our cities and manufacturing establishments, by the Irish, German, and Italians. In the country and farming-districts, they still remain to a considerable degree; but, so far from fearing that they shall be crowded out, they are only too glad of any chance to get

out. The coming of foreign laborers, instead of being a source of alarm to the educated American laborer, is a source of rejoicing. It affords him a chance of rising above manual labor on the shoulders of the new-comers. With every additional body of laborers, just so many more opportunities are opened for a man of intelligence and familiarity with the country to "make a living by his brains." The day of that ideal American society, in which the farmer's hired man gave the lecture before the Lyceum, and the "help" in the kitchen wrote poems, when the cobblers studied French, and the factory-girls conducted a magazine, has passed away. It was possible only for a short period, in the first dawning of a higher culture and the flush of a new ambition, amidst the generous rewards of a virgin soil, and among a sparse population of simple tastes. When wealth accumulated, and greater luxury began to enter; when social rivalry was awakened, and the standard of comfort elevated; when silk dresses, pianos, and carpeted floors became social necessities; when the population became denser and competition greater, and the hands among whom the products of the soil were to be distributed more numerous; when the pressure of double work came to be borne continually; and especially when cultivated tastes became more fully developed,—that form of society could no longer sustain itself. The rewards, opportunities, and honor of manual labor, fell below what was necessary to maintain one's respectability in society. They were entirely inadequate for what the opened mind and refined taste of the educated American aspired to, and what his aroused ambition aimed at. The American laborer had then either to give up his aspirations for material comforts, social dignity, and intellectual culture, or else to find some more remunerative and congenial employment. Many at once yielded to this necessity, chose the latter of the two alternatives, and became our successful merchants, manufacturers, employers, inventors, bankers, and lawyers. Others have resisted it, and have attempted, by dint of incessant and exhausting exertions, to keep their daughters at the seminary and their sons at college, and their parlors equipped with piano and sofa, by the toil of

their own unaided hands. But the strain has been too great. It has shattered the nerves, disordered the stomachs, worn out the bodies, and made hard, weary, and joyless the lives of our native farmers and mechanics. They are finding this out, all over the country. They are abandoning manual labor, and crowding into the cities to seek some more lucrative and less trying occupation.

This desertion of manual labor by our native population has gone on much faster than the foreign laborer has come to enter it. For evidence of this, we need only turn to the fact which is familiar to every one who has ever remained half a dozen weeks in our country or suburban districts, that it is exceedingly difficult, often impossible, to get a man or woman to do any kind of farm, house, or mechanic work, at a score of miles' distance from our great cities, even at the best of wages. Here is a great gap in the ranks of our manual laborers, which needs to be filled. While this deficiency in their number, this difficulty of getting their assistance for rude, hard, and distasteful work, lasts, almost every one outside of our cities must perforce do a large part of such work himself; and too many will find country life an exhausting and odious drudgery, dissatisfying to the higher sensibilities and aspirations. The remedy is to introduce from abroad a full supply of cheap and reliable labor, — a laboring class which will be content to remain in the position of a laboring class.

We may feel regret at the prospect of such a change. We may long to retain and revive the old American ideal, — our old boast of native laborers, as intelligent, comfortable, and respectable as the rest of the community; but it is no longer possible, any more than that a mammal's structure should be as homogeneous and simple as a polyp's, or that a grown man should live on the same quantity and quality of food as he did in his childhood. The fact is, as we have said, that that ideal is already doomed; that our intelligent, native laborers either have been already crowded out, or are voluntarily abandoning manual labor faster than others can fill their place. However much we may prefer them, they will not stay: they are not to be had in any sufficient quantity. The

choice is not between the intelligent native laborer and the ignorant Chinese foreigner, but between the foreign immigrant from Europe and the foreign immigrant from China. The great want of our country at present is an abundance of cheap and good labor. Our capitalists and employers are suffering for lack of it. Our professional class need it, to lower the cost of living. Our farmers want it, to relieve them of their drudgery. Our native mechanics and laborers want it, to make possible their own rise to the higher stations to which they aspire. Our housekeepers, especially, want it in their kitchens. The East wants it in its mills and manufacturing, so that they may be able to compete with European work. The West needs it, to develop its immense mineral and agricultural resources, and to fill its vast unpopulated territory. For the sake of the Union it is needed, that, by means of it, manufacturing pursuits may become as easy and profitable at the West and South as at the East, and thus the business interests of the different sections of our country be made similar, and one of our most ominous sources of dissension be removed.

We must get this supply of labor somewhere. As we cannot get it at home, we must get it by immigration from some foreign country. China offers us this supply, in abundance and cheapness exceeding any other source. In other respects, the supply which China offers seems equal to any kind of labor which we can obtain. The Chinese are exceedingly patient and persevering. They learn with great quickness, and, once taught how to do a thing, will do it every time in the same identical way. They are careful, tractable, and industrious; neither saucy, restless, nor ambitious; content without society, amusements, or church of their own different faith; satisfied in the country as in the city. They do not strike or demand eight-hour laws. They do not stipulate before going to house-service, for two afternoons a week and all their evenings, and hot and cold water in the kitchen, and no children in the family. Intoxication is very rare among them. In California, says Mr. Brace, —

“People everywhere speak well of them, and agree that they are the most industrious and steady of laborers; not as efficient, perhaps, as the Irish, but more regular and sober, and with a great talent for imitation. In person, they are the neatest of creatures. I have seen a whole gang, after a day's work on a farm, washing themselves all over with warm water, which they keep ready for their return, as carefully as a company of gentlemen; and I was assured that this is their daily habit. The common laborers are said to keep a horn instrument for cleaning their tongues every morning. They are always neatly and nicely dressed, and are much more agreeable coach-company than the Mexicans or Spaniards here, who are exceedingly ‘odorous.’”

The Rev. Mr. Nevins, for ten years a missionary in China, who is the author of the latest and one of the best books on China and the Chinese, says that it is the testimony of foreigners generally, that the Chinese make excellent servants.

“During our residence of ten years in China,” he says, “we hardly ever had occasion to dismiss a servant. In nearly every case a strong attachment sprang up between them and us; and, in more instances than one, I have felt personally grateful for services and attentions which I could not reasonably have required, and which were all the more grateful because rendered spontaneously and heartily. We had so little fear of theft that our doors and drawers were often left unlocked, and servants and numerous visitors had free access to every part of our house.”

A better combination of the qualifications for desirable servants and manual laborers we may challenge any other class or race among us to present. Certainly, neither the Irish, the Africans, nor our Anglo-Saxon laborers equal it.

But, granting the labor question to be decided, a more important one may overrule the decision, which, looking at this point alone, we might give. This is the question: “What sort of an element, in our politics and government, will the Chinese be? Will their influence on our society, our institutions, and our civilization, be a desirable one? Can we transform them into a homogeneous part of our body politic? Can we impregnate them with our American ideas of

education, liberty, equality, and progress?" This is a very serious question. It is equally difficult to answer, as yet. Were our government despotic or oligarchical in form, or were its suffrage restricted to those of American blood or native born, it would give us little cause for anxiety. But with our republican constitution, and our American idea that every one who steps on our soil becomes at once a full citizen, with the right of joining in the government of the country, it is a most momentous and difficult question.

Could we have kept this country as the exclusive home of our own native population, or of the Anglo-Saxon race; or could we have kept even the suffrage out of the hands of those of foreign race and birth,—it would undoubtedly have been infinitely better for the safety and success of our institutions and our civilization. But this ideal, like the ideal of the intelligent, respectable native laborer, is a thing no longer within our choice. The time when any such preservation of our native population from the admixture of a lower foreign ingredient was possible, went by long ago. It is already more than a decade and a half of years since the party formed expressly to resist the influence of our foreign element ignominiously failed in getting even an extension of the legal period of probation before a foreigner could vote. Americans themselves were the promoters of the influx of immense swarms of the poor of all Europe; and, almost as soon as they landed, put the ballot into their hands, and put out of their own the ability to control or stop their coming. This invading multitude still pours across the Atlantic to our shores. The lower classes of Europe will continue to send their hundreds of thousands annually as long as our huge tracts of unoccupied land invite the squatter, and wages here continue higher than there. If the Chinese are not allowed to enter the country, this condition and this European immigration will last for many years. If the Chinese immigration be admitted and encouraged, it will soon so fill up the country and lower wages, that the advantages of emigration to the poor of Europe will cease to be large enough to tempt them to make the long journey, and venture the risks, trouble, and

cost of the way. The real question, then, is, — not as it will be and is sophistically put, — “ Shall we alloy our intelligent native population with these ignorant and degraded foreigners ? ” — for it is impossible now to prevent its being alloyed with ignorant and degraded foreigners from somewhere, — but, “ Shall they come henceforth from Europe or Asia ? shall we allow the lower classes of our population to be filled up entirely from the laboring classes of Europe, or shall we for the future take in a large proportion from Asia, and lessen the number from Europe ? ”

Much may be said as to this, on both sides. As yet, the Chinese have not come here to stay, and have had no desire to interfere in the government of the country. Not more than one or two out of their whole number have been naturalized, and none of them has ever voted. They come here only temporarily, for the purpose of laying up a small competence ; and as soon as they have done so, return home. They have not fled from a detested government to make use of this as a base from which to operate against the authorities at home, and to assist themselves by embroiling us with a country that we ought most of all to be at peace with. They are not zealots in the cause of a Church in whose interest they will seek to control our local politics and to alter our educational system. On the contrary, they are remarkable for their religious tolerance, — perhaps, even, it may be called religious indifferentism. Their favorite maxim, according to the Abbé Huc, is, “ Religions are many, reason is one ; ” and it is a rule of courtesy with them, when with one of a different religion from themselves, to praise his, and depreciate their own. They are not likely to double our taxes for the support of their paupers, and the repression and confinement of their criminals, or to make our streets unsafe with their drunken rows. The number among them that ever disturb the peace, depend on charity or the public, break the laws, or violate the rights of property or life, is unusually small, as compared with all other classes. The peace, courtesy, and endurance of injuries which Christians preach, the Chinese practise. In all these respects they are

far more desirable immigrants than those from that island of Europe from which has come the largest single supply of our present foreign population.

The difference in race between the Chinese and the rest of our foreign population may very possibly become a source of ethnic jealousies and dissensions; but it is possible, as well, that it may prove a useful balance to the excessive influence of our European element. We need certainly entertain no apprehensions of the deterioration of our stock from the amalgamation of the Mongolian race with it. The idea that the quality of a stock is lowered by admixture with another, has been found to be the very opposite of truth. It has been found that such mixtures of race are beneficial to both parties, and are even occasionally necessary with races, just as with families, to prevent them from decaying. The races which are at the head of European civilization — the English, German, and French — are those which are most mixed. The races of Europe which are the most backward — the Portuguese, Spanish, and Greek — are those which are most pure. The vigor of our own people is due in considerable measure to the great union of different races which is already found here. The qualities of the Chinese are very well fitted to be united with the American traits. Their mild, contented, polite, reverent, and rather phlegmatic temperament will be an excellent neutralizer to our brusque, over-nervous, hurrying, pushing, restless, and irreverent character.

In regard to that most important question, the state of morals among the Chinese, there seems to be a great deal of difference in opinion. Some describe them as a degraded race, deceitful, sensual, cruel, and cowardly. Others declare that in the practice of the Christian virtues they surpass Christian nations themselves. They are probably, in fact, as far from the race of liars and thieves which their depreciators would make them out to be, as they are from the ideal nation of mild philosophers with whom Voltaire took pleasure in comparing the Christians of his time. The Chinese among us, having been subjected to legal oppression, and to the unrestrained outrage of our worst rowdies, it is only natural

that they should resort to arts and acts of as bad a nature for defence and revenge. Those who have been the first to come to this country, and those who congregate at the open ports of China where Americans generally get their impressions of the Chinese, are of course in great measure the lowest part of the people, — adventurers, separated from the restraining influence of their families and of home society, who have come for a short period to engage in the general scramble for money. It is evident that they fall far short of affording us a fair representation of the character of the general body of the people, or of the character of the immigrants that we shall obtain in the future when they come in large numbers from the interior of the country. In respect for parents and the aged they far surpass us. Their standard of propriety, and of what the public taste requires in books for general reading, and in objects openly represented to be seen and admired by the young and old of both sexes, is also higher than ours. A nude representation of the human form is hardly to be found among all the innumerable idols and images of the empire. In their literature, as well as in their paintings and sculpture, there is a scrupulous solicitude to avoid all indecent and immoral associations and suggestions. "No people," says Thomas Taylor Meadows, who is an acknowledged authority on Chinese character and literature, "no people, whether of ancient or modern times, has possessed a sacred literature so completely exempt as the Chinese from licentious descriptions, and from every offensive expression. There is not a single sentence in the whole of their sacred books and their annotations that may not, when translated word for word, be read aloud in any family in England." The same propriety is observed in their theatres. Vulgar and immoral plays are proscribed by law, and are comparatively rare. They are found generally only in obscure villages in the country. In secret, however, there are done with them, as with us, things which are not to be spoken of. Among the middle and lower classes the habit of using obscene language is a common one. This is said to take the place of the profanity found in Western countries, and to be followed

from the same motives, and to about the same extent. Drunkenness, as we have said, is infrequent; but gambling, secret vice, and the use of opium, are said to prevail to an extent not known in Europe or America.

Infanticide has been charged with being a common crime among the Chinese. In some places, as about Fuchow, says Nevins, it is common, but in other parts of the empire it is very rarely that you find well-authenticated instances of it. It is confined almost exclusively to female children; and is due to the over-crowding of population in China, and the difficulty of marriage, which is absolutely the only means of support which a woman in China has. In this country, it would not be likely to occur at all. The extent of infanticide among the Chinese has been supposed very much greater than it really is, because of their superstitious practice, in many parts of the empire, of casting away, unburied, the bodies of dead infants. When Europeans see these dead bodies floating in the rivers, or lying on its banks, or by the city walls, or hanging from trees, they erroneously infer that they are the work of infanticides.

In regard to honesty, there is probably a considerable lack of it among the lower classes. When dealing with the petty traders, one must be on his guard if he does not wish to be imposed upon. In the large cities, especially the foreign communities, it is hardly safe to leave coats and umbrellas near the hall-door when that is unlocked. There is considerable corruption, peculation, and extortion among the government officials. But this is as true of New York or Washington as of Canton or Peking. Mr. Nevins says that he has travelled hundreds of miles in the interior at different times, and in different parts of the country, sometimes entirely alone, and has been completely in the power of perfect strangers, who knew that he had about his person money and other articles of value, but has always felt nearly as great a sense of security as at home; that he has heard the testimony of prominent merchants, who have had large business transactions with the Chinese, both in China and California, who have represented Chinese business men as very prompt and relia-

ble in meeting their business engagements; that Chinese agents are often sent into the interior with large sums of money, to purchase silks and tea, the person sending them having no guarantee or dependence but that of their personal honesty; and that he has known genuine "one-priced" stores in China where you are sure to obtain a good article at a reasonable price.

He adds, further, that he has met in China with some of the most beautiful instances of affection, attachment, and gratitude which he has ever known; and that he has made the acquaintance of not a few Chinese, whom he regards with more than ordinary affection and respect, on account of the natural amiability of their dispositions, their sterling integrity, and their thorough Christian principle and devotion. Mr. Brace fully corroborates Mr. Nevins in regard to the trustworthiness of the large Chinese business houses in California. The conclusion to which an impartial judge must come to, in regard to Chinese morality, must be, we think, the same as that of Mr. Nevins, — that, in the standard and practice of virtue, there is no such difference between China and Christian lands as to form the basis of any very marked contrast, or to render it modest or prudent for us to designate any vice, or class of vices, as peculiar to, and especially characteristic of, the Chinese.

In person, we have said that they are cleanly. Their houses, furniture, and settlements, however, are often, it must be admitted, very filthy and noisome. Many virulent diseases maintain themselves among them; and epidemics are more frequent and much more severe than among the inhabitants of this country.

Some races, it has been noticed, readily conform themselves to the usages of whatever land and society they travel or emigrate to. When at Rome, they not only do as the Romans do, but soon become transformed into regular Romans, and are no longer to be distinguished from the rest of the community. Other races, however far from home they may go, and however long they may stay, retain tenaciously their own national peculiarities. The French are an example of

the first; the English of the second class. The difference seems to be due to the greater imitative tendency of the French. The great activity of this faculty among them is shown by their superiority in all kinds of manufacture where great exactness and delicacy is required. Now, the Chinese are famous for this same imitative faculty; and it is natural to expect that it will tend powerfully to assimilate them easily and speedily to our institutions, if they come to settle permanently among us.

In addition to the predisposition which this faculty gives them to conform to our society and institutions, they have a considerable preparation for them in their own intellectual development, and educational and political system. Chinese who have been educated with Europeans, have shown themselves in no way inferior in mental ability. China has an extensive and valuable literature. She has been for centuries the centre of light and civilization to Eastern Asia. She has given a literature and a religion to the thirty or forty million of the Japanese, and to the inhabitants of Corea and Mantchuria; and by these and other nations and countries of the East is looked up to as an acknowledged leader and teacher. In Chinese literature may be found, in pretty clear outlines, the prototypes of almost every prominent form of European thought and speculation. Confucianism, for example, with its worship of ancestors and benefactors, and its doctrine of the insufficiency of the human mind to attain to any knowledge of spiritual or divine things, and our consequent duty to ignore them, and put our whole attention and labor upon earthly and material things, anticipated by three thousand years one of the essential principles of the Positive Philosophy, which is regarded by many as the final result of all Western philosophizing. In the writings of Confucius's great contemporary, the founder of the Chinese Rationalists, we find the main doctrines of that other "last word of philosophy," the transcendentalism of Schelling and Hegel; and also, at the same time, many striking parallels to the teachings of Jesus. In science and the arts, as well as in philosophy, the Chinese have anticipated us. They invented before

us the art of printing, the use of gunpowder, and the magnetic needle, the manufacture of paper, porcelain, china-ware, and silk fabrics. Of the modern sciences, — chemistry, geology, astronomy, the use of steam and electricity, — the Chinese know of course hardly any thing. But neither did we, four hundred years ago. At that time, the Chinese, in all the arts and knowledges and habits of civilized life, were certainly the equals, if not the superiors, of European nations. Since then, while we have advanced with unparalleled rapidity, they have halted in the path of progress. But this is only a temporary stop, a thing of the last few centuries only, and does not justify the charge which has been brought against them of ancient and native immobility.

Already they are beginning to advance again. The commercial energy and enterprise which they display at home, and throughout Eastern Asia, show that they are ready to enter into the path of modern progress as soon as they are assured of its advantages. Steamboats are superseding junks in the river and coasting trade of China. The Imperial government has given up for good, as it would seem, its traditional policy of exclusion. It has taken away from the provincial authorities the management of its foreign affairs, and assumed the control of them itself. It has taken men of the most civilized and progressive Western nations into its ambassadorial service, putting an American at the head, and by them has negotiated treaties with the leading powers of Europe and America, such as promise to bring China into free and equal and more intimate relations with them. Wheaton's "International Law" has been translated, and adopted as the guide of the Imperial government in its relations with foreign countries. It is reorganizing its army and navy, building gunboats, and adopting European arms and drill. It has abandoned the old system of farming out the collection of the duties, and has established a Marine Customs Service. In this both foreigners and natives are employed. The Inspector-General, at the head of the service, is a foreigner of marked ability. Liberal salaries, competitive examinations, and promotion according to merit, secure for it

the ablest young men; and it is said to be the most efficient and honestly conducted revenue service in the world. A university has been established at Peking expressly to teach foreign arts, sciences, and literature, under the superintendence of professors from Europe and America. The young men who will be educated here in European knowledge and ideas, will become influential officers at home, authors of Chinese works on the modern sciences, and translators of European literature.

A powerful stimulus cannot but be given by these means to free thought, inquiry, and material progress throughout the empire. In view of such reforms, was Mr. Burlingame at all extravagant when he averred that there was "no spot on this earth where there had been greater progress made in the last few years than in the Empire of China"? Under the invigorating influence of American institutions, society, and example, then, can we doubt their having both the desire and the capability to go forward in the march of modern civilization?

The Chinese government is an example, at once, of the intellectual and organizing capability of that people, and of their devotion to freedom and order. Their system of government and code of laws have elicited a generous tribute of admiration and praise from the most competent writers of Christendom. Mr. Meadows characterizes it as "at once the most gigantic and the most minutely organized that the world has ever seen." Whatever its abstract merits or demerits may be, it has certainly the testimony of successful practice. It has the evidence of the great fact that it has stood the test of time longer than any other government during the world's history, that it has bound together into one nation such a vast mass of people, and given to them such a homogeneousness of character and ideas as the world affords no parallel to, and that it has given that multitudinous population a degree of prosperity and comfort such as will excite our wonder.

The Imperial government of China, instead of being a despotism, as commonly supposed, is, as Rémusat, Huc, Nevins,

and other writers have abundantly shown, a strictly limited monarchy, — limited not only by the careful restrictions of a written constitution, but by the efficient power of a watchful public opinion, which, when the government fails in its duties, or stretches its prerogatives beyond the bounds of ancient custom, soon recalls it to its duty by the voice of a hundred thousand pamphlets, and the personal remonstrance of the chief officers and distinguished men of the nation; and which, in the case of gross abuses of power, does not hesitate to employ force, and eject the offending emperor from the throne. The idea that the people are the source of power, and that government is only a trust, was uttered by one of their most revered philosophers, more than two thousand years ago, and has become embodied in the thought and practice of the people. The people of China are accustomed to a great deal of self-government, not only indirect, but direct. The towns and villages of China elect their own local magistrates, without any pressure or dictation from the Imperial government in regard to their choice; and every man in the town is both capable of electing and of being elected. The Chinese are a people among whom the passports, espionage, and petty governmental interference of many European States nowhere exist; among whom, outside of the small handful of the Imperial family, there are no castes, no privileged nobility, no hereditary classes of any sort, nor any hereditary distinctions; among whom all offices and titles are open to every man by virtue of merit alone; and among whom a system of competitive examinations as the means of getting the best officers for the service of government, which Europe and America are just beginning to see the necessity for, has existed for thousands of years.

China is a land where newspapers and books are common, and where primary education is as universal as in the United States. Among the countless millions of that empire, there are hardly any, it is said, who cannot read and write sufficiently for the ordinary purposes of life. This is accomplished principally by private schools, voluntarily supported by the people out of their own purses, but free day schools are not

uncommon. In familiarity with the principles and practice of civil liberty and general education, and in the qualification resulting from this, for becoming desirable members of our republic, the Chinese would seem to be superior to the people of most European States.

There is one thing, however, which it must be admitted is a great drawback to all these qualifications. This is the great difference in religion between the Chinese and ourselves. Between a Christian and the follower of any form of Chinese religion or superstition, there is an incomparably greater gulf of thought, association, habit, and custom than between any of the different divisions of Christianity. This could not but create mutual prejudices, hostilities of feeling and act, and clashings of interest. While our national and state constitutions and laws seek carefully to maintain entire freedom and impartiality as to religious matters, and to keep state and church as separate as possible, still we are in fact a Christian nation. Christianity underlies our whole political and social system. It has determined the fashion of our civilization, our common-school exercises and instruction, our legislative and judicial proceedings and forms, and our days of labor and rest. On all these points, great difficulties may be created by the introduction of a large population, whose religious customs and associations have been formed outside the influence of Christianity.

Many hope that the Chinese by settlement in this country, and being surrounded by Christian influences, and becoming the objects of Christian proselytism, may become converted to our own faith, as our African population has been. There is certainly a hope of this. But it will be accomplished, if at all, with much more difficulty and slowness than the conversion of the negro race. This latter race came to us without any determinate religious faith, children in intellectual and religious and social attainment. The Chinese come as a mature, highly civilized people, with faiths and usages to which they are wedded by the custom of centuries. The efforts which have been made in California for their conversion have been only moderately successful. If they go over to Christianity

in any large numbers, it will probably be into the Roman Catholic Church. Incredible as it may seem, and difficult as it is to account for, it is a fact that there is a long and minute correspondence between the rites, customs, and objects of worship of the Roman Church and of Buddhism, the religion of the greater part of Chinese immigrants. Both religions have a supreme and infallible Head, celibacy among their priesthood, monasteries and nunneries, prayers in an unknown tongue; prayers to saints and intercessors, especially to a virgin with a child; prayers for the dead; the use of a rosary and of a cross; works of merit and supererogation; self-imposed austerities and bodily inflictions; chants, burning of candles, sprinkling of holy water; bowings, prostrations, religious processions; images and pictures, fabulous legends and relics. This extraordinary coincidence gives to the Roman Church a great advantage over every Protestant sect in the work of proselytizing the Chinese. Even if the Chinese become converted to Christianity, they will not then, in respect to religious faith, be as desirable a class of immigrants for our country as the Protestant immigrants from Germany and Scandinavia, whom we have lately begun to receive in large numbers.

Taking these different considerations on the one side and the other into view, some will doubtless find the preponderance on the affirmative, others on the negative side of the question. It is, as we have already said, a difficult question, which we are hardly in a position to give an unhesitating answer to; but if called on for a provisional decision, we should say that it seems to us, on the whole, that the Chinese promise to form as valuable an addition to our population, and to be moulded as readily into harmony with our institutions, and into a homogeneous part of our society, as the larger portion of our present foreign population.

But, whatever doubt may rest on this question in the mind of the candid inquirer, there are two things on which no doubt or difference of opinion ought to exist. These are, that if the Chinese come at all, they must, in the first place, come only as freemen, never in the semi-bondage of a coolie's

position; secondly, that as soon as they step the first foot on American ground, they must have their equal civil rights and the protection and redress of our laws and courts secured to them. It is a burning disgrace that this inoffensive, industrious, and law-abiding race are still denied this, on our Pacific coast, and are handed over by the laws themselves, without hope of redress, to unrestrained insult, plunder, outrage, or murder, by any white ruffian who wishes to gratify his envy, his greed, or his brutality at their expense. Such unbridled license to our worst passions towards any human being is far more corrupting to our institutions than would be the admission of half a million Chinese at once to the franchise itself. The annals of injustice bear everywhere this warning,—that oppression demoralizes and degrades the oppressor as much as the oppressed; that the contempt for law, order, and justice, which it fosters, the tribe of rascals, desperadoes, and brutes whom it breeds, soon turn from the original victim to rend and destroy its own ranks and the parent state.

ART. VI.—LIBERAL CHRISTIANITY IN EUROPE AND AMERICA.

WHEN, last year, the editor of this Journal was travelling in Europe, among many other leading representatives of Christian Liberalism whom he had the pleasure of meeting abroad, he made the personal acquaintance of the Dean of the Faculty in the Theological School at Strasburg,—Professor Bruch. A recent private letter to the editor, from this distinguished scholar and noble gentleman, presents the present position of Liberal Christianity so clearly and succinctly, that he has thought a translation of it would furnish the readers of this journal with as good a summary as they could anywhere find of the present prospects of Rational Christianity upon the European continent. The editor has thrown what he hopes may prove timely views of the history and prospects of Liberal Christianity in this country, into the

form of a letter to Professor Bruch, which, as it serves to bring European and American Christian Liberalism into connection, may possibly be of some interest on both sides of the water. Without farther introduction, we proceed to put this correspondence into our pages.

STRASBURG, May 6, 1869.

Christian Church of the Confession of Augsburg, in France:

MY DEAR SIR, AND MUCH RESPECTED BROTHER IN CHRIST, — I am blamable for not having long ago thanked you for the regularity with which, for a year past, you have seen the "Monthly Journal" of the American Unitarian Association, forwarded to me. I have found many things, in perusing this journal, which have interested me in the most lively way. I have seen proofs of what you told me when I had the pleasure of seeing you here, that the Unitarian body in America, so far from being in a state of decline, as many French religious papers had assured us, was, on the contrary, in full progress. I have also seen that American Unitarians were anxious to put themselves in relation with Protestants of the same faith in different European countries, and that during the last year there have been exchanges of fellowship between them and the Unitarians of Hungary, who are probably descendants of the Socinians expelled from Poland.

What has interested me most has been to notice the tendency of American Unitarianism to draw to itself those numerous enlightened Protestants, who, not being able to accept popular Orthodoxy, have felt themselves wholly alienated from the Church, and in danger of falling into complete apathy. Against this tendency among ourselves there has sprung up in Southern Germany, within three or four years, a society called the "Protestant Union" ("Protestanten-Verein"), which has already a wide extension. We have formed at Strasburg, for the Protestantism of the south of France, a similar society, which draws together a great number of clergy and laymen, and which publishes a journal, much circulated, called "Le Progrès Religieux."

The Protestant Union of Germany originated in the necessity of withstanding the policy of the Orthodox party; which, thanks to government protection, had become dominant in Prussia, Hanover, Saxony, Bavaria, and many of the small principalities of Germany. This party had succeeded in driving out of the universities in those countries all the professors in theology, of liberal views, and then gone on, in the nomination of pastors for churches, to manifest a complete

spirit of exclusiveness towards all who would not lend themselves to the support of Orthodox dogmas. In spite of the opposition which this society has met from the ecclesiastical authorities of the above-named countries, the Protestant Union has succeeded in establishing, even there, numerous auxiliaries. To exert an influence over the masses, it holds annually, in different parts of Germany, — and even in those parts where the strongest antipathy to it exists, — reunions, in which its most distinguished orators may be heard. The most active members of this society were Professor Richard Rothé, and Professor Schenkel, of Heidelberg. Unhappily, Rothé, who enjoyed an eminent position among German theologians, and who was universally loved for the nobleness of his character, was taken from us two years ago.

In the Orthodox party in Germany, as in the Lutheran Church in France, there has sprung up an extreme party of ultra-Lutherans, who insist, with an inexorable rigidity, upon the confessional creeds; and seek to break, wherever they can, the union which for forty years, in most parts of Germany, has subsisted between the Lutherans and “the Reformed;” showing towards the Reformed an implacable dislike, and aiming to carry public worship back to the forms of the sixteenth century. There is in this party a visible inclination towards Catholicism; and many pastors connected with it, like the Ritualists of England, have already been bold enough to introduce into public worship forms utterly Romanistic. Among the people, this party finds little countenance; but, as in England, it finds a good deal among the aristocracy; and it would not surprise me, if, on occasion of the approaching Ecumenical Council at Rome, a very great number of the German nobility should pass over into the Catholic Church. You will understand that it is against this party that the Protestant Union aims its directest efforts. It is also in their ranks that it finds its most relentless adversaries, who do not hesitate, with blatant voices, to pronounce it a work of Satan, and to threaten all who have part in it with a condemnation to eternal ruin. This party, however, is a shocking anachronism. The same may be said up to a certain point of all Orthodox creeds. The spirit of the age is entirely contrary to them. Tending in all its concerns to progress, and with an irresistible pressure, how can the age adapt itself to a stationary theology, which aims to petrify Christendom?

Unhappily, there is also among us liberals a party of ultraists, which, proceeding from one denial to another, has almost got far enough to abandon Christianity altogether; a party which dreams of

a church of the future, in which each individual may believe or disbelieve just what he wills, — completely forgetting what Jesus has said of a kingdom, a city, a house, whose inhabitants are divided against themselves, and which cannot stand. Quite recently this party has made a demonstration at Neufchâtel, in Switzerland, which has produced a great sensation. A liberal Protestant society has been formed in that city, hitherto considered a rampart of Orthodox Protestantism; which announces in its manifesto the creation of a church, to which Jews, Christians, and Mahometans, believers, infidels, and even atheists, shall be equally welcomed. I have profoundly regretted that some of the champions of Protestant liberalism in France should have been so far misled as to give in their adhesion to such a monstrosity.

At Paris, Protestantism occupies the same position in which you found it on your late visit. The Reformed Consistory has continued to drive out of all the churches of the capital, the liberal pastors, and specially M. Athanase Coquerel. This compels the liberal people, who compose at least half of the whole Protestant population of Paris, and certainly the most enlightened part, to wander away from the official churches, and to organize congregations for their own edification. The schism is not yet complete; but a wedge has been driven which will inevitably end in schism, if the Consistory does not change its spirit and tactics. A split among the Protestants of Paris would doubtless be followed by similar splits in other parts of France. This would be an irreparable misfortune for French Protestantism; which, finding itself in a feeble minority, has great need of union, and a closing up of its own thin ranks. Meanwhile, the Liberals display a notable zeal. Their ablest orators are in constant motion, holding conferences now in one city, and then in another. We have heard many of them this winter in Strasburg. For we found it desirable to organize a series of public meetings in Germany and France, which have attracted great numbers of people, and have produced a deep impression.

In general, throughout the Protestant churches of the continent, as in the Catholic Church, there exists an unusual activity. Every thing seems to me to presage an epoch of change, from ceiling to foundation, in these churches, — a great religious crisis. Which of those churches will first find this crisis rending its bosom is a providential secret. It is at least possible that it will be the Catholic Church. I know that there are Catholic prelates in Germany who

are profoundly dissatisfied with the course of the Papacy of late, and with the spirit of it. If the expected council sanctions, as is probable, papal infallibility, the assumption of the Virgin, the anathemas which have been pronounced against the "Syllabus Errorum," it is possible that a movement may spring forth in Germany, in which a great part of its Catholic population, with their bishops at the head, may separate themselves from the Roman Pontificate.

I have not had time to speak of the *fête* at Worms, in which I participated. I know that there were American delegates there, and your religious journals have doubtless reported its proceedings. Never has a solemnity more magnificent or more attractive been celebrated in Germany; I doubt if any one will compare with it elsewhere.

And now, my much-honored brother, allow me, in ending this letter, perhaps already too long, to express once more, and more emphatically, the joy I experienced in making your personal acquaintance. It was also very pleasant to me to meet, six months ago, an acquaintance of yours. I mean Mr. Robinson, then American consul in our city. Remember me cordially to your son. May the Lord keep you and shower upon you his mercies! Receive the assurance of my high esteem and fraternal devotion.

BRUCH.

To Rev. H. W. BELLOWES, D.D., New York, U.S.A.

WALPOLE, NEW HAMPSHIRE, U.S.A., July 23, 1869.

To Professor Bruch, Strasburg, Germany:

MY DEAR PROFESSOR AND BROTHER IN CHRIST,—I have been waiting to reach my summer retreat in the mountains of New Hampshire, before acknowledging your welcome favor of the 6th May. It has given me great pleasure and instruction, and calls for my warmest gratitude, that you should be kind enough to remember one who enjoyed so *brief* an opportunity of making your acquaintance. The best return I can make for your excellent review of the prospects of Rational Christianity in Europe, is to give you a succinct account of the past and present condition of our cause in America.

Unitarianism (the only scholarly and critical form of Liberal Christianity in America), although latent for a half-century before, really began its distinct, separate existence as a branch of the Christian Church in this country, only about the year 1818. About that time, Dr. W. E. Channing began his energetic controversy with the theo-

logians of Andover, the chief seat of American Orthodoxy. The theological dispute which then broke out, developed suddenly and rapidly a vast amount of *un-Trinitarian* and *un-Calvinistic* feeling in the State of *Massachusetts*, — the only part of the country where scholarship had advanced sufficiently to permeate any considerable part of the people with a critical and candid spirit.

It was accordingly in *Massachusetts* (specially in *Boston*) that many *Orthodox* churches practically abandoned their old confessions and connections, and allowed themselves to be called Unitarian. For five and twenty years the loosely related body grew rapidly; until, *thinly* scattered over other parts of the country, and *thickly* sowed in *Massachusetts* alone, it numbered, perhaps, two hundred and fifty churches. There, about 1840, it seemed, unaccountably, to come to a *stand*, and to spread no more. Great expectations had been raised of its growth in cities out of New England, — New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, and specially in the larger towns of the *West*; but all these hopes were disappointed, and Unitarians began to doubt and distrust their own mission, and specially their power to sustain a great national movement of an ecclesiastical kind.

The truth is, the same upheaval which had separated them from Orthodoxy had all the while unconsciously been straining at the sinews and breaking the dogmatic chains of Orthodox theology and discipline within its own domain; until the old creeds against which Unitarians had violently protested, and out of which they had broken by main strength, had lost so much of their imprisoning power, and their galling weight, that the old reasons for revolution and change of ecclesiastical name and relations no longer existed. The Unitarian Reformation, like the Lutheran, lost head by the latent triumph of its principles. Orthodoxy became so mild, genial, *liberal*, and politic, that people were content to remain under its gentle yoke. Had the present state of opinion in the popular creeds of America been a half-century ago what it is *now*, we should probably never have heard of any Unitarian Church in America.

It is not ecclesiastical liberty for which any portion of the American people is now conspicuously contending; and the whole ground of the Liberal Christian movement is essentially changed. Such has been, for a quarter of a century, the influx of speculative and scientific light, that all the old questions between those who then accepted the Scriptures and a supernatural revelation with equal reverence, — questions concerning the person of Christ and the nature of the Atone-

ment, &c., — are now utterly lost in the more anxious and serious questions of our own day, touching the existence and providence of a personal God ; the possibility of a *verbal* revelation ; and the existence of a spiritual and immortal essence in the individual man. These questions, which have left the guardianship of theologians and passed into the hands of educated and thinking people of all nations and classes, have almost wholly superseded our old theological controversies, and made the disputes in which our Unitarian body arose appear trivial and insignificant. Meanwhile, positive and dogmatic faith has become everywhere loose and uncertain. The Christian Church, though flourishing and earnest and active, is working mainly on undogmatic grounds, animated by sentiment, practical usefulness, and the necessity for supplying the people with spiritual ideas and religious forms. Preaching, among educated people of all sects, has become moral and untheological, confining itself to the truths of natural religion, *flavored* with Christian associations, and supported by the example of Christ. Christianity is as dear as ever to the people, but not for the old reasons, or on the old grounds. A majority of Americans are Christians, and connected with Christian churches, and have a most solid and resolute purpose of bringing up their children in the church, without whose influence, restraints, and illumination, they sincerely believe public virtue and freedom would both die. They are, also, disposed to hold on to the old creeds and the old statements ; not from any warm attachment to them, or any considerable positive influence derived from them, but simply because they form a protecting crust about a precious, delicate, and volatile essence, which they dread to lose, if the vessel that has hitherto held it should be broken. This fear, more than any attachment to, or even practical influence from, Orthodox dogmas, sustains the large and powerful churches of Orthodox confessions in this country at this time.

But meanwhile, another, and perhaps the most characteristic portion of the American people, — say, a third of our population, — have lost their whole interest in dogmatic Christianity, in religious institutions, in forms of faith, and modes of worship. They are usually not active and open railers at Christian faith and its ministers, but real indifferents, and utter neglecters of all organized religion. Yet it could not be said that they are specially loose in morals, wanting in public spirit, or in any way degraded. On the contrary, they are often the largest readers, the most active philanthropists, the best citizens. And, at the present moment, there is a strife between two

classes of Liberals: first, the class that ignores Christianity as an ecclesiasticism or a dogma, and is really going back to natural religion for its warrant and base of operations; and, second, the *Liberal Christians*, who maintain the continuity of the Church, under all its reforms and restatements. Which of them shall get possession of this detached and free thinking body of our people, and organize them either into free religious associations, or into Christian churches?

Our Unitarian body has furnished the leaders of both these movements. Theodore Parker, whose disciples have gone much beyond their leader, must be considered as the head of the *Free Religious* movement; while Dr. Channing is the real founder and inspirer of the *Liberal Christian* movement. Previous to his day, the type of Liberal Christianity in America was English Unitarianism, with Priestley and Belsham for its expositors. This was just as critical, exegetical, and literal as Orthodoxy itself, and had all its weaknesses and want of adaptation to the new times, without its grim and passionate vigor. It was confined to a select class of scholars and refined people, and had no popular power in it. It survives; but, like an annuity for one life, will die with the generation now going off the stage, or certainly with the next. With Channing, the Unitarian body seemed first to receive "the Holy Spirit"! A living and present God, an immanent Deity, poured his inspiration into our cold and formal system, and lifted us above the dominion of the letter, and the freezing atmosphere of a negative and critical temper. It cannot be denied that Dr. Channing's influence largely contributed to the making of such men as Parker, Emerson, and their successors, and that his own spirit and direction were logically unfavorable to church institutions. He was really a mystic and a solitary soul, appreciating very imperfectly the solidarity of the humanity of whose individual representatives he was such a reverential lover and eulogist. It is only fair to add that the largest part of the aspiring young men of highest ability who have sprung up in our ranks since Parker's day, have been more distinguished for their free-thinking and rationalism, than for their faith in the *Liberal Christian Church*. They have been markedly disorganizers and disintegrators of all theological systems and institutions, and seem now to be of the opinion that something *better* than the Christian Church is about to take its place. And yet those of this school who were bred in the ministry have commonly found themselves held in it, by motives of habit and attachment, and by the difficulty of creating any new organizations with which to fur-

ther their own earnest opinions. There are, perhaps, few of our ministers whose names are known beyond their parishes, who have not been at one time or another decidedly touched with Rationalism; while hardly any representatives of Liberal Christian ecclesiasticism have understood themselves well enough to take a decided stand in favor of continuing the Unitarian body, as one in which liberty of thought and theological progress were to be united with positive faith not only in *Christ*, but in the *Christian Church*.

It is this fact which renders so remarkable the present revival of our *denominational life* as a Unitarian Christian Church. The *Unitarian Church* in America, having bequeathed its spirit to the free religionists, or Mr. Parker's school, was pronounced dying, if not dead. Its best and most grateful friends were constantly muttering its requiem and anticipating its funeral service. Ten years ago, its most intelligent disciples were saying, "It may last out our time." Orthodoxy was justified in saying that it was in a state of seeming decay. Our theological students had fallen off, our missionary spirit declined. Episcopacy, Catholicism, and Congregational Orthodoxy were running off with our devouter disciples. We were rapidly losing ground. We no longer dared to call Harvard College a Unitarian college, and at several elections of president the courage of nominating an active Unitarian minister failed. Our men of wealth ceased to leave bequests for denominational purposes. It became the fashion among our rich Unitarians to patronize Orthodox institutions with one hand, if not both, while our own colleges were left to suffer.

Something has brought this retrograde movement not merely to a halt, but has converted it to a "forward march"! Within five years, or more particularly since our late war, Unitarianism in its church form, as a Liberal Christian ecclesiasticism, has taken up a wonderful courage, assumed new vigor, rallied a new set of disciples, emboldened many of its lukewarm friends of days gone by, and begun to found churches in new territories, while putting out vigorous shoots within its old ground.

The reasons for this are not far to seek. The war, with earthquake power, shook the whole basis of popular superstitions, and made a new settlement both necessary and easy. Such a mighty wrench as the tearing of slavery out of our vitals, brought with it many other rooted prejudices. It accustomed the people to new ideas and great changes; set them a thinking; made them very suspicious of mere *use and wont*; revealed them to themselves; and taught thou-

sands, in hospitals and battle-fields, to see the difference between essence and form, spirit and letter, dogmas and faith. The effect on the Orthodox communions was something truly tremendous! It will be impossible for one generation to exercise much clerical guidance or priestly restraint over the American people. They have begun in all denominations to have a strong lay competition for the teaching function. Books attacking the extravagancies of Orthodoxy are immensely popular. Mrs. Stowe's and Miss Beecher's writings, and now Miss Phelps, of Andover (in a little book called "*The Gates Ajar*," of amazing circulation), are really scattering all the old dogmas, and giving the freest wing to speculation. The whole religious mind of America is therefore *in motion*, and it is comparatively easy to *guide* what is *moving*. Our influence was small, when there was a dead-weight of passive resistance to meet; and we nearly died of the indifference we encountered. But now that the public ear is open, and that Orthodox leaders are free-thinkers and free-talkers, it begins to be seen that, if *reason* is to be carried into religion, those who carry it there with most vigor and candor and success have the best right to be heard, and that Unitarians are no more to be dreaded than Orthodox Rationalists. Indeed, it may be truly said, that the boldest preachers now before the American people, and the most revolutionary (in fact, though not in principle), are in the *Orthodox* ranks. There is, so far as they choose to avail themselves of it, about as much freedom of opinion there as among us. And nothing separates a considerable portion of the Orthodox clergy of all denominations from our own, except custom and a prudent regard to appearances. I have heard a leading Orthodox clergyman and professor avow the opinion, that if the early Unitarians in Massachusetts, instead of acknowledging themselves heretics towards the popular creed, had only claimed to be *more Orthodox*, they would by this time have carried the whole state over to their own way of thinking! In places where Orthodoxy is most liberal and enlightened, avowed and organized Unitarianism finds its own existence hardest to maintain. Dr. Bushnell by his courageous dealing with Orthodox dogmas, and his rational exposition of the Trinitarian creed, has made it impossible hitherto to sustain a successful Unitarian church in Hartford, Conn., where he has lived and reigned for nearly forty years. Mr. Beecher, by his admirable liberalism under the Orthodox banner, has made a mild creed, with all the advantages of the old associations and the prestige of Puritan antecedents, and with most of the rights

and privileges of the Unitarian body, possible to thousands who eagerly read his weekly sermons now regularly published in many thousand copies, and adopt his elastic, indefinite, and mongrel creed. By means of his powerful personality, the Orthodoxy of America is unconsciously passing over, — as on a bridge, beneath which runs a river, hidden by night, — from the old domain of a restrictive, police-guarded, light-fearing, and submissive dogmatic faith, of which sacramental mysteries and theological contradictions were the characteristic features, — to the new territory of practical Christian faith, where thought is free, reason honored, and light welcomed, and where the people are invited to judge for themselves, and from their own immediate experience, and to test, by all known and demonstrated truth in other departments of thought, what is true, credible, essential in theological statements and Christian doctrine. There is, probably, no man living, who from his pulpit exerts as wide and decisive an influence as Mr. Beecher; and it is hard to say, whether he has prolonged or shortened the nominal ascendancy of Orthodoxy! By holding on to its catch-words, and being able without insincerity to profess some of its most characteristic dogmas, such as the Deity of Christ and the mysterious efficacy of his death, while rationalizing in the most unqualified way, and avowing the broadest and most liberal ideas, he has reconciled millions to Orthodox organizations and confessions, who might have been repelled, had not such a free interpreter of those creeds occupied in popular eyes the leading place in their church or party. On the other hand, he has undermined Orthodox dogmas and creeds so extensively by his free thinking and bold speech, his irresistible common sense and practical administration of religion, that hardly more than its appearance and shell remains in the minds of his disciples. It does not change the fact that they do not always or commonly know it, or that they might angrily and resolutely deny it.

The influence of Mr. Beecher in secularizing religion and the pulpit has increased the tendency, which the slavery and temperance questions had first provoked, to make political and social reforms legitimate topics of religious and Sunday discussion. The effect has been to mingle theological and practical ideas; to remove the barriers between the laity and the clergy; to create a popular tribunal for faith; to precipitate the ministry into the world, and to draw the people into the church. The most popular and influential ministers in America are as well known on the platform and in the lyceum as

in the pulpit. They commonly repudiate clerical dress and manners; mix freely in ordinary society, and value themselves as men and citizens quite as much as in being ministers. On the other hand, laymen are taking up what were long supposed to be ministerial functions. Extensive organizations exist known as Young Men's Christian Associations, whose objects are religious, though practical and not theological, in which clerical influence is not only subordinate, but usually somewhat carefully disowned, and through which the common-sense theology born of American experience is rapidly creeping into the Orthodox churches. It is true these Young Men's Christian Associations make occasional stands against avowed forms of Liberal Christianity; and their delegates in council at Portland, Me., have just now, under clerical inspiration, proclaimed a platform studiously and offensively exclusive of Unitarian fellowship upon equal terms. But the very necessity of such a declaration clearly enough shows the irresistible tendency to a practical union in faith and work of so-called Orthodox and so-called Liberal Christians. And if young Orthodox laymen may repudiate, they may also another year acknowledge and even encourage, fellowship with Unitarians. There can be no doubt that the action at Portland was highly favorable to the prospects of Liberal Christianity. Every thing that emphasizes lay influence is so; for lay influence in the Church in America is directly or indirectly liberal influence against Orthodoxy, and in favor of an uncreeded Christianity. The present struggle of the Methodists for lay representation in their church councils, which is sure to succeed, is the inevitable liberalizing of their ecclesiastical methods and creeds; while the effort of the Episcopalians to procure a revision of their prayer-book points in the same direction.

I have thus far endeavored to explain the influence of the war, and of American life in earnest times, upon the ameliorization of theological opinion, and the prevalence of a mild and charitable, a rational and liberal faith, under Orthodox names and organizations. And you will think, perhaps, that this simply indicates a continued diminution of the necessity for any formal organization of Liberal Christianity as such, and a probable supplanting of the ecclesiastical function of the Unitarian Church. If the old established sects modify their creeds and discipline to meet public sentiment, what chances have new ones, or what necessity? None, 'it might have been said, ten years ago. And yet, although the tendencies of Orthodoxy are growing more liberal all the while, Liberal Christianity as such, as a

church and an organization, has taken a fresh start, and is becoming an earnest, a missionary, and a progressive body. And the reason is this. The era of *indifference to opinions* is slowly passing away. Erroneous and irrational statements of Christian faith are borne with for a long time, when free and rational interpretations of them are admitted. So much comfort and relief is found in this liberty of interpretation, and the cessation of clerical tyranny and ecclesiastical discipline, that nobody cares for a long time for the severity of the symbols themselves; and they stand unrepealed, and even revered as relics. But the time comes, when the inconsistency between creeds and the real views of those who profess them becomes offensive to candor, courage, and the sense of fitness and truth; when the value of old associations diminishes, and the importance of fresh and clear statements begins to reappear; when a large class of persons have not only got clear of their old dogmatic faith, but begin to realize a repugnance to it, and to enjoy and demand a distinct repudiation of it, and a new beginning on wholly distinct and plain grounds and statements. It is not the old and born Unitarians who are best able to realize this want, nor is the old ground of Unitarianism the best field to illustrate it in. We begin to find our best missionaries in the Unitarian body to be men who come over to us from Orthodox churches, ministers converted to our faith, and with a sense we who were born in the faith do not possess, of the extreme value of a definite and even aggressive liberal creed. And we are discovering, in the newer and fresher parts of the country, — the more characteristic America, — a welcome for a definite liberalism, which shows us that, with one or two generations, the influence of the old creeds dies out upon our new soil, and all attaching associations decline. Not only is the soil left free for a new plant, but the American sense of the value of institutions comes in to demand that a free and rational spirit of faith shall take on a positive and instituted form, and that Christian churches shall exist, which, in an open and definite way, organize the large liberal ideas and hopes and belief of the people. This tendency, though not fully developed, is now clearly indicated.

The Christian instincts and spiritual affections and aspirations of the American people, in the more enlightened and liberal communities, have not yet become fully accustomed to the new soil and new climate and new culture into which they have been transplanted. Long accustomed to an artificial shelter, trained upon the trellises of fixed dogmas, and tended by official authority, it is easy to see how

long it has taken them to strike root in the exposures of the open air of religious liberty, without the support of established creeds and the guiding hand of an authoritative priesthood. But the native vigor of the plant of faith is beginning to triumph over its disadvantages. Deprived of its artificial supports, religious faith is beginning to feel and assert its natural strength. The Christianity in the blood and souls of the people, and which many had come to think had its sole existence in certain now discarded opinions and traditions, is proving its independent spiritual life by putting forth fresh shoots from the root which criticism and free thought had cut down to the stump. Natural religion, as it grows, discovers itself in a clearer and nobler form in Christianity, and drops the dangerous error, that nature and grace, reason and revelation, the human soul and Christ Jesus, are in antagonism to each other. Some of the liberals, by study of history and of other religions, and more still by experience, have learned that religion is necessarily a social principle; that it must have a *cultus*; and that religious forms and times and seasons, sacred days and sacred books, and persons exclusively devoted to its service, are indispensable to its uses and its nature. A certain wholesome reaction in favor of ecclesiasticism is manifest in all Christendom, and almost strictly in proportion to the dogmatic decay which exists. The increasing splendor of the Roman-Catholic worship, and the attractions of that Church for Protestants, especially in Great Britain and America, is one evidence of men's strong craving for external worship. The astonishing growth of ritualism in the English Church, and her American daughter; the reaction of Lutheranism in Germany, under Hengstenberg's leadership; the inclination towards a more liturgical form of worship in all the orthodox sects, with the enrichment in color and architectural decoration of the church edifices of all denominations, and the taste for more artistic music in church choirs, — all these things prove the irrepressible yearning of the religious mind of our age for visible and incorporated church institutions. Comte's well-known self-evolved ritualism, with more than the formalism and technicalities of Romanism, shows that even atheism is not free from religious necessities and the forms of worship. The free religionists in America, when not of Quaker origin, are not without their own tendencies to ritualism. It is hatred and dread of Romanism which has alone kept Protestantism so bare of visible symbols for two centuries. With the decay of papal power and the disappearance of priestly domination, ritualism must revive, and

Christian worship everywhere grow truer to human tastes and wants.

It is not too much to say, that, amid all these blind and unconscious tendencies, the only church in America that has studied the past and the future, that lives from its thought and knowledge, that consciously represents the freest and yet most religious tendencies of the age, is the Unitarian Church. It has the happy fortune of seeing its purely critical, negative, and destructive period, a quarter of a century behind it. What are new and alarming questions to other Christian sects, it has long ago disposed of and survived all their peril. It alone is wonted to the climate of absolute freedom. It has lived through drought and winter. Feeble as it is, it has passed through and outlived all the diseases which attack new religious developments, the moral and spiritual mildew and worm and blight. Fear, hatred, persecution, indifference, social ostracism, spiritual horror, ecclesiastical censure, all that time-established Orthodoxy could do to annihilate it, it has done; and, however injurious or obstructive to its rapid growth, it has not killed it. Self-criticism, self-distrust, extravagance, and idealism, impractical methods, and theories pushed to extremes,—the more dangerous foes to its life,—have proved no more fatal. The practical secession of many of its own disciples into what is called sometimes naturalism, and sometimes free religion,—its later and still more perilous enemy,—has not destroyed it, although it has been near seeming death under this affliction. But, with all these trials and drawbacks, the Unitarian Church not only lives, but begins to grow; grows where it would not grow for half a century; springs up spontaneously in new communities; increases in its old fields; takes on an active missionary spirit; is getting practical and earnest in its methods; begins to busy itself with settling Christian forms and usages upon its own foundations; honors its own name; is writing new commentaries or making new translations of the Scriptures, and preparing Sunday-school books and catechisms for its children; extending its scheme of theological education and recruiting new men to its ministry; draws the free men from other pulpits to its own; raises five times the sum it used to do five years ago for strictly denominational purposes; and circulates its literature with success not only among its own people, but more or less among the clergy and laity of Orthodox Christendom. Unitarianism distinctly recognizing itself as Christianity, and determined to maintain its historic antecedents, and to live from the gos-

pel root, is every day clearing away the obscurities and doubts and fears that long enveloped it. Above all, it is slowly obtaining a Christology of its own, and a systematic theology, which will furnish lucid, definite, and tenable opinions to those who know that religious sentiment cannot for more than one generation live divorced from religious opinion, and that the momentary, fashionable cry against dogma and creed, is certain to discover its own weakness the moment satisfactory dogmas and creeds come to invite the human mind and heart to their coveted embrace and repose.

It may even be said that although the free religious movement, which since Mr. Parker's day has been always ultimating itself, is now more distinctly and separately organized, and in hands more vigorous and gifted than it is ever likely to find itself again, yet its own candid leaders are not over-much encouraged with their prospects. Its earnest and gifted leader, judging from his writings, does not himself seem to believe in the possibility of organizing for any work, or building up any institutional body upon the simple foundation of the love and pursuit of moral and spiritual truth. Without a dogmatic foundation, either implied or professed, institutions of any kind are impossible. Accordingly and wisely, the honest men who have gone back to natural religion or further still, but yet have this vocation of public teachers, are rapidly discovering that, while eloquent individuals here and there may hold personal followers about them during their own lives, churches and congregations wither and die, when denied a Christian foundation and creed, implied in symbols, if not written in words; understood, if not expressed. I may be sanguine in my hopes, or purblind in my perceptions, but I believe that Rationalism openly divorced from Christianity can no more thrive in America than pure Deism or open Atheism; that whatever seeming success, and it has been alarmingly great, has hitherto attended the theistic party in the Liberal body, has been due to the Christian education and flavor of those who have led it, or to their identification with certain other noble reforms, popular and captivating in their spirit and direction. A theism denying Christianity and abandoning its traditions and usages, no abilities and no personal worth and purity among its representatives and advocates have yet shown themselves able to root in the American mind. And I believe that the tendency has reached its climax, and is already on the decline. With the whole force of the Unitarian body thrown into the Christian branch, I am confident that in five years it will throw off all that

cannot be absorbed, and without violating its own free principles. There seems to be a glorious future before the American Unitarian Church. I might tell you how large the percentage of growth has been within five years ; how great the promise in the North-west ; how rapid the increase in our sales of denominational books ; how insatiable the demand for able and earnest ministers ; how active our laity and our women ; how successful our local conferences ; and how promising our national conference. But all this you will learn better from the "Monthly Journal," which I rejoice to learn you receive regularly. I have already abused your patience with this long letter. Nothing but the desire to put you in complete sympathy with American Unitarianism could excuse it. Rejoicing in all you say of our prospects in Europe, I offer you the expression of my fraternal love, and am, in the bonds of the gospel,

Your obliged friend and brother,

HENRY W. BELLOWS.

To Prof. BRUCH, Strasburg, Germany.

ART. VII. — REVIEW OF CURRENT LITERATURE.

THEOLOGY.

"PREPARATIONS" and "abridgments" of foreign works by American editors and translators are always to be distrusted, even when the principles on which the omissions and changes are made are frankly stated in the preface. When a narrow sectarian translates the work of a broader thinker, the chances are that he "improves" the original work to suit his own dogmatic prejudices, and that he leaves out the most liberal parts. We do not know that Mr. Lacroix has done this in the case of the work of Pressensé on the Church in France during the Revolution.* If we may trust his word, he has faithfully given "the spirit, the doctrines, and the judgments" of Pressensé's book, condensing only the portions "not so interesting to the non-French reader," and slightly enlarging other portions by the addition of historical and explanatory matter. An American Meth-

* Religion and the Reign of Terror, or the Church during the French Revolution. Prepared from the French of M. EDMOND DE PRESSENSÉ. By Rev. JOHN P. LACROIX, A.M. New York : Carlton & Lanahan, 1869. 12mo, pp. 416.

odist, perhaps, is not the best judge of what "non-French" readers of works of this kind prefer; and it would seem that the "elucidating" matter might have been more conveniently given in the form of notes, than by insertion in the text, spoiling the smoothness and clearness of the narrative. Possibly, these insertions have caused some violations of a good idiomatic style in the English work, which otherwise might be attributed to the diffuseness of the French author. Even with this allowance, there are several passages in which the exact sense of the original has not been given by the translation. In the very first sentence of the introduction, we read of France and Europe, "inspired with an *inexperienced* ardor for universal reform." A too literal rendering frequently betrays the translator into ungrammatical English. Occasionally, we find blunders which can hardly have been in the original, as on page 371, where the husband of Miss Patterson, "the youngest of the Emperor's brothers," is called *Joseph Bonaparte*; and on page 386, where we read "that the dictator of Brumaire was logically bound to *impose* on religion the same *claims* which he was forging for the whole body of the nation." We have not seen the original, but should judge from the context that it said, "fasten upon religion the same chains." The translator, too, invariably calls the French Abbé, "Abbot," bringing in so, not the original idea of a priest, but the idea of superior in a monastery, which Sieyès and Grégoire certainly were not. It is fair to say, however, that in this false rendering Mr. Lacroix may have been misled by the French dictionaries in common use.

The book itself is very interesting. After a rapid survey of the relation between church and state in the centuries preceding the Revolution, of the influence of the tradition of Gallican liberties, and of the writings of the philosophers of the eighteenth century, it shows us the gradual and steady progress of the idea of true religious liberty, until it was crushed by the Cæsarism of the great Napoleon, and the Church, both Catholic and Protestant, was made only the vassal of the state. The sympathies of the author are, as we might expect, with the Abbé Grégoire, and the party, who, while defending the right of private judgment, and of free prophesying, make no concessions to the irreverent and infidel spirit of the age. He sees in this party the saviours of religion in all that stormy time of the Girondists, the Terrorists, and the Directory. They maintain the rights of faith against the excesses of atheists, and the follies of the philanthropists, and enable the Church, when the storm has passed, to recover

its lost ground, and to come back to its former possession. That Rome is in religious possession of France to-day, is due, not so much to the resistance and the martyrdom of recusant priests, who would not subscribe to the constitution of the nation, as to the more patriotic wisdom of those priests and scholars who consented to the will of the people, yet held firmly to their hereditary faith in the truths of the creed and the Bible.

If the closing chapter of the book has not been improved by the American translator, it is certainly very bold writing for a subject of the third Napoleon, and shows that the strict censorship of the press cannot shut the mouths of all critics of the imperial rule. What Pressensé says of the acts and spirit of the uncle is equally exact in showing the acts and spirit of the nephew. The attitude of the despot who could respect all religions as a matter of state-craft, with an equal contempt for their spiritual claim, is precisely the attitude of the present sovereign of France. The position of the churches in France is certainly a great deal better than it was two centuries ago, even with the protection of Protestants by the Edict of Nantes. Catholic, Protestant, and Jew can live side by side, and have their rights guaranteed by the civil code, and their hands held back from fratricidal warfare. Yet the servitude of the Church to the Empire is as galling to Catholic as it is to Protestant. It is humiliating to be confined to metes and bounds, and to take a charitable stipend from the hand of the master. The spirit of propagandism has no chance where religion is under the supervision and control of the state. In France, as in England, the only class that are content with the present religious position, are the Liberals, who are able, under the protection of the secular power, to have free utterance of their heresies and their speculations.

A thorough and impartial work on the actual condition of religious faith in France, and the relations of religious parties, is greatly to be desired.

“SACRED Archæology,” * in the language of Mr. Walcott means all the appendages of the priesthood and the rituals,—knobs and bosses, choral pauses in the psalms; pocularies, or “consecrated

* Sacred Archæology: a popular Dictionary of Ecclesiastical Art and Institutions, from Primitive to Modern Times. By MACKENZIE E. C. WALCOTT, B.D. London: L. Reeve & Co., 1868. 8vo, pp. xvi., 640.

drinking-cups;" "pargettings," "the ornamental plastering on walls;" grave-diggers in the catacombs; torch-bearers; — every thing, and every man, in fact, that has had any thing to do with matters ecclesiastical. Paradise is sacred; "Hawpulling Towels" are sacred; "Pultog Holes," apertures for scaffolding left in church-walls, are sacred: we have the holy sponge, the holy brush, the holy spoon, the holy voice-tube, and the holy pouch. This archæological dictionary is one of the first literary fruits of ritualism, and is a sign of the time. It shows us to what this reaction is tending, and what kind of puerility and folly it would fasten upon the churches. A great deal of singular and quaint learning is compressed in this goodly octavo; but the strangest thing is, that a sensible Englishman should find pleasure in bringing such stuff together. We have more than two pages about the *cope*; three pages about the mitre; more than two pages about the pall; and the account of the Rood Loft, concisely written, fills three full pages. None of the articles in the volume are tedious, and there is no sentiment to dress out the facts. There are nearly two thousand titles of separate articles and notices; and the information is drawn from a great variety of sources, English and foreign. The spirit of the work is good, not harsh or controversial. Mr. Walcott deprecates the "desecration of sacred and solemn subjects by the unchastened language of human passion." He therefore has no severe rebuke for the iconoclasts, when he mentions the broken images, and no sad lament over the good time gone, when he tells how pious customs have died out, such as head and feet washing, before the "Competentes" received baptismal unction. The only practice which stirs his mild wrath, is the practice of *restoring* ancient churches, which in his view is more dangerous than the ravages of armies, mobs, or fanatics. He invites the suggestions of critics, whether hostile or friendly, and is prepared to welcome their word. The verdict of the critics will be, that the book is very good of its kind, but that the kind seems to have lost its value in an age of reason and light.

C. H. B.

"THE Tripartite Nature of Man"* is a fascinating book. Its style is clear and flowing, its arrangement scientific, the learning is

* The Tripartite Nature of Man, — Spirit, Soul, and Body; applied to illustrate and explain the doctrines of Original Sin, the New Birth, the Disembodied State, and the Spiritual Body. By Rev. G. B. HEARD, M.A. Edinburgh: J. & T. Clark, 1868. 12mo, pp. xxiv., 363.

ample, the argument ingenious, and the enthusiasm of belief is delightful and almost contagious. The writer believes and therefore speaks. He writes from a conviction, deep and earnest and mastering, that he has found in this theory of the threefold nature of man the solution of all philosophical difficulties, and the real harmony between the science of the soul and the dogmas of the Bible. There can be no question that his exposition of Paul's psychology is more correct than the distortions of the commentaries. It is impossible to bring this apostle into the company of the dualists, who see in man only body and soul, flesh and spirit. It is not so easy to demonstrate this of the other New-Testament writers, or to show it as the view of Jesus. Indeed, Mr. Heard does not pretend that Jesus taught in so many words the later doctrine of Paul, but only that he gave a deeper meaning to the word "soul" than the old Hebrews gave, and so prepared the way for the apostolic doctrine. This "trichotomy" was one of those views which he merely hinted, but reserved for the spirit of truth to teach more fully. Yet as we read the conversation with Nicodemus in the light of our present knowledge, we seem to see that Jesus was speaking of the latent spirit, when the rabbi understood him as speaking only of the psychical soul.

In spite of its beautiful enthusiasm and its reverent use of the Scripture language, the book is unsatisfactory. It assumes that the Orthodox scheme of theology and salvation is true; that God is divine, that man is fallen and depraved, that physical death came through his sin, that the atonement of Christ is vicarious, that punishment is eternal. It will allow no analogy between the threefold nature of man and the threefold nature of God. The one is a philosophical theory, perfectly intelligible and reasonable: the other is an ineffable mystery, above all reason. Man is "three natures in one person," God is "three persons in one nature." The tripartite man in no way helps us to understand the mystery of the Godhead. As a criticism of the notion of a double nature in man, soul and body wholly distinct, the argument of the book is sound. But who will base now a scientific psychology or theology upon the literal legend of Genesis, which is so self-contradictory?

And as little satisfactory to physiologists will be the speculations of the book about the resurrection body, that it will have a nervous without a nutritive system, senses without circulation; that it will share all the functions of the first body, except those of propagation and nutrition. The view here given of the physical body, and the

intermediate state of the soul, and the final union of the *pneuma* with the regenerated *soma*, — for Mr. Heard makes a distinction between the *sarx* and the *soma*, — is certainly much in advance of average orthodoxy. But it is also much less spiritual than that of Swedenborg, whom Mr. Heard stigmatizes as a fantastic dreamer. Indeed, for spiritualism of any kind he has a pronounced contempt. His pneumatology is not spiritualism. Neither the psyche nor the pneuma can exist without a body. And an inconsistency of the book is, that it allows the absence of all body in the intermediate state, and shows only two of the three elements able to get along comfortably in mutual help without any third element, — able to prepare themselves in this bodiless purgatorial state for the future reunion with their former body.

This book of Mr. Heard's, though simpler and more straightforward in its method of reasoning, belongs to the class of which Dr. Bushnell's works are the best known specimens, — of works which show the weakness of the views which they oppose better than the soundness of their own view. The "trichotomy" really makes Orthodoxy no more rational than the dichotomy. The essential difficulties of the scheme remain, whether we suppose that man has two, three, or five natures. The utmost that the trichotomy accomplishes is to show apparent value in a few physical analogies, and to add another factor in the work of redemption. It really *explains* nothing in giving three instead of two unknown quantities, in adding z to x and y .

C. H. B.

HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY.

SIMULTANEOUSLY with the volume of Lectures reviewed in another part of this Journal, the Massachusetts Historical Society published a volume of their Proceedings, from April, 1867, to March, 1869,* which will be read with nearly equal interest, and is not less deserving of a permanent place on the shelves of every historical student. Its interest is mainly biographical, and the larger part of its contents consists of memoirs, prepared in accordance with the practice of the Society, to preserve in its published Proceedings some account of the lives, characters, and writings of its deceased members. The me-

* Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society, 1867-1869. Boston: Published by the Society. 8vo, pp. 519.

moirs thus included in the volume before us are a very full, elaborate, and carefully prepared account of the life and various literary labors of President Sparks, by the Rev. George E. Ellis, D.D., based partly on personal knowledge and partly on the private journals and other unpublished writings of that eminent scholar; two charming memoirs of Judge Story and President Felton, by the Hon. George S. Hillard, than whom no one could have executed the task more gracefully, or from a more intimate familiarity with their personal and intellectual traits; a brief but sympathetic sketch of the life and writings of the Rev. Dr. Jenks, by the Rev. George W. Blagden, D.D.; an excellent account of the life and judicial services of Chief-Justice Shaw, by his associate on the bench, the Hon. Benjamin F. Thomas; and a very admirable memoir of that pure-hearted and large-minded merchant and scholar George Livermore, by his intimate personal friend, Mr. Charles Deane. The peculiarly close relations which existed between them, and a judicious use of Mr. Livermore's private papers, which were placed at his disposal after his friend's death, have enabled Mr. Deane to produce a biography which leaves almost nothing to be desired, and ought to be separately printed as a just tribute to one of the best of men and most indefatigable of historical students. If its plan, and the purpose for which it was prepared, had allowed a fuller account of Mr. Livermore's religious life, the memoir would have formed a very acceptable introduction to the series of Unitarian biographies so long contemplated by the Unitarian Association. It is due to the character of Mr. Livermore, and to the services which he rendered as a member of the Executive Committee of the Association, that some sketch of his life should be included in any biographical series thus prepared; and of such an account Mr. Deane's memoir must be the basis.

Besides these papers, the volume also contains an interesting and valuable Essay on the Seals of Massachusetts, by Mr. Thomas C. Amory; a thorough and satisfactory report on the Hutchinson Papers, by the Rev. Dr. Ellis; an important and hitherto unpublished letter of Nathan Dane to Daniel Webster, on the Ordinance of 1787; and numerous other letters and documents of historical interest and value.

Like all the volumes recently published by the Society, it is beautifully printed; and it has a very full and accurate Index, the want of which in the volume of Lectures on the Early History of Massachusetts must be regretted by every reader.

C. C. S.

THERE are many persons of moderate means, who will be glad to know of a descriptive treatise upon Pompeii, in the English language, sufficient in detail and illustration to meet all the ordinary wants of a scholar. Mr. Dyer's work * before us is, to be sure, less complete than Overbeck's; and the wood-cuts, although numerous and excellent, are not at all equal to the German. But as a whole the book leaves little to be desired. It will give a very satisfactory notion of this city of the dead, even to one who has never been there; and the maps, plans, views, and restorations afford ample materials to any person of imagination, for reconstructing it quite accurately. We are inclined to think, however, that even so truthful representations as these would lead most persons to expect greater completeness than really exists, so that they would be sadly disappointed by the ruin and dilapidation of the original. Somehow, pictures, from their smoothness and neatness we suppose, almost always carry the imagination a little beyond the rude original. And we fancy that this is still more the case with the restorations of Pompeian edifices, of which quite a number are given, after Mr. Dering. Perhaps no feature of the volume is more valuable than this; but however correct these restorations may be in details, they convey an impression of much more spaciousness and grandeur than we conceive to have existed in this provincial town, or than the actual dimensions of the ruins would suggest.

The work of the editor is exceedingly well done. Mr. Dyer had already won a high reputation by works of a similar nature, in his articles in Smith's Dictionaries, — particularly that upon the city of Rome, — which are among the best of their kind. This reputation he has not forfeited, even by his late quixotic attempt to undo every thing that has been accomplished by Niebuhr and his followers. If he has failed as an historian, he stands in the front rank of antiquarians. He has consequently made of this account of Pompeii a nearly complete treatise upon Roman antiquities, — so far, that is, as the externals of life are concerned. The construction of temples, theatres, and amphitheatres, — embracing accounts of the drama and the glad-

* Pompeii: its History, Buildings, and Antiquities. An account of the destruction of the city, with a full description of the remains, and of the recent excavations, and also an itinerary for visitors. Edited by THOMAS H. DYER, LL.D., of the University of St. Andrews. Illustrated with nearly three hundred wood engravings, a large map, and a plan of the Forum. Second edition. London: Bell and Daloy, York Street, Covent Garden. 1868. 8vo, pp. 579.

iatorial shows, — houses, baths, &c., is well and fully described here ; and these special chapters are quite worthy to form part of a complete treatise upon antiquities. In this view the lack of an index, which would at any rate have been very useful, is unpardonable.

When we say that the editor's work is well done, however, we must add that it is not always possible to tell whom we are praising. Mr. Dyer "edits" the treatise published originally by the "Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge," about thirty or forty years ago ; and in order to bring it down to the present date, and at the same time keep it within reasonable limits, he has not only added, but omitted, transposed, and recast, to such an extent as to make it his own ; and one reads along with great satisfaction, thinking it is all the time Mr. Dyer's book, until he comes of a sudden to a footnote, signed *Editor*, correcting some statement in the text ; but shortly after, with no indication of a change of authorship, there will be references to recent publications or recent discoveries, showing that here Mr. Dyer is the author. This is worse than an inadvertence. Whoever, indeed, works over a book in this way, makes himself responsible for all the original matter that he retains ; and the book as a whole, no doubt, represents Mr. Dyer's views nearly as well as if he wrote every word himself. But it is only *nearly* as well. That the unity of the work is injured by this confusion in authorship is something : the chief objection is, that the reader cannot feel the same confidence in what he sees before him that he would feel in statements that rested unequivocally upon Mr. Dyer's authority. Views cannot but change in thirty years ; and there may very easily be expressions in the original which the present editor would not care to alter, but which he would not have used himself.

One slight criticism we may make upon the proportions of the parts. For a guide-book, for which use this volume is well fitted, there is none too much space devoted to the descriptions of the individual houses ; but the great majority of readers would gladly exchange a few of these for some more details upon points that illustrate the private and municipal life of the people, particularly the *graffiti*, for which it is rather aggravating to be only referred to rare and expensive foreign books. What Mr. Dyer gives us upon this head is well chosen and most acceptable : we only wish there were more of it.

Among the especially good things in the book, we will mention the account of the *vela*, or canopies, of the amphitheatre (p. 222) and

the remarks upon the manufactures of the ancients (p. 356). Whether the original author or the editor should have the credit of these we do not know: it must be admitted that the substantial unity of the work is so perfect, that its best features might be easily attributed to either.

W. F. A.

THE class of religious biography to which Mr. Fox has just added the life of one * who was making an era in the history of our Sunday-schools, is exceedingly small: not that many things of this sort have not been attempted, but that the work has been badly done, false in its spirit, and evil in its influence. Many of these biographies hide all that is most valuable in their subject, — his or her failures, weaknesses, and indiscretions; many others are written with the purpose of glorifying a particular creed, of course exaggerating its influence over an individual life, and denying its contracting, sometimes paralyzing, power over other minds: sometimes, the idol-worship is so excessive that one catches hardly a glimpse of a well-known friend; as, in the Sunday-school libraries, religious children are always beautiful as angels. The worst perversion of the opportunity of doing good by cheering the Christian with an inspiring example, is when a covert assault is made on some obnoxious sect, and facts are misstated, and insinuations are made to prejudice the public against those who cannot be heard in self-defence. It need not be said that the memoir of the secretary of our Sunday-school Society is tainted with none of these faults, is generous in spirit, honest in statement, and free from man-worship; that the labor of love is performed with wise reference to the thousands of children who reverence Mr. Walker as a spiritual father; that, therefore, it will take its place alongside of the memoir of Henry Ware and his wife, as a silent builder-up of Christ's kingdom. One of the best things about it is, that, except in his year's labor for the Sunday-school Society, his life would pass for a failure, and had more than an average of disappointment, being baffled in the attempt to establish a bureau for our religious literature. But, in the spiritual sense, there was no failure at all; there was constant discipline, marked growth, a beautiful unfolding of character, and a conscious ripening for that home into which he entered too soon for us, but not for himself. Many are the excellent words he has spoken, like those to one reduced from affluence,

* Memoir of James P. Walker, with Selections from his Writings. Boston: American Unitarian Association, 1869.

"I know it is unpleasant, but a man can never be quite sure of his manliness until he is stripped of the moral support of respectable belongings, and obliged to make shifts to get along. If he can do that with self-respecting dignity he may thank God for putting good stuff into him." But the best word of all was his life, so contented, loving, hopeful, diligent, prayerful, brave, that it quickens in every sympathizing breast the consciousness of immortality.

F. W. H.

THE prolixity of Coleridge's biography of Keble ; * his constant apologies for the introduction of personalities ; his frequent diversions to side-topics ; the occasional use of unmeaning letters, — make one desire, for the author of the "Christian Year," such a biographer as George Herbert found in Isaac Walton. Still, through all imaginable imperfections, the beautiful spirit of that English Greenwood makes itself felt, — consecrating every chapter ; blessing every event ; making the whole impression like rich cathedral music heard from afar. Not only satisfied to live away from the homage his talents, learning, piety, might have readily found, Keble devoted himself to the poor. When unable to preach, he gave all his strength to pastoral visiting. When absent from his parish with his sick wife, he cared not to preach in others' pulpits so much as to minister in the humblest homes ; especially caring for the children of the flock. His preaching was not eloquent, learned, popular ; but, in almost tearful humility, in childlike simplicity, and motherly tenderness. He undervalued his pulpit efforts, so that it was hard to persuade him to print. He shrank from all display ; and never liked to be hunted out as the great Christian poet. Still, upon the occasion of an American gentleman's desiring, at the close of the church service, a bit of ivy cut by his own hands from his church-wall, Keble was amused, and answered the request with a liberality that must have cheered many distant homes. Coleridge speaks almost judiciously of the holy influence of Keble's famous book, representing it, truly enough, as putting the tasteful reader into that state of feeling in regard to himself which his conscience approves, and, towards his fellow-beings and his Maker, that in which he would desire to be ; soberly hopeful as to himself ; loving, grateful, and reverential to his Maker. But, a vast deal more ought to have been said of some of the most beautiful lyrics in the language ; of hymns which are peculiar

* Memoir of the Rev. John Keble. By Right Hon. Sir J. T. COLERIDGE. Oxford : Parker & Co., 1869.

favorites wherever known, and spiritual musings which kindle a flame of cheerful devotion in unnumbered hearts. There was wanting, however, something of musical taste, something of large acquaintance with mankind, something of the vigor of a progressive faith, to save his hymns from being, at times, wearisome and monotonous. Keble's death came on as he was reading the scripture-lessons to his sick wife. Coleridge, speaking of Keble's repeating the Psalms after his sister was dead, at her bedside, intimates that she might still hear the words, with enlarged apprehension and more unmingled delight. Besides the "Christian Year," in several editions, and the "Lyra Innocentium," Keble published the "Psalms of David," in English verse; "Ecclesiastical Adoration;" "Argument against Divorce;" two "Tracts of the Times;" "Letter to a Member of Convocation;" "Catholic Subscription to the XXXIX Articles;" "Life of Thomas Wilson;" "Academical Sermons;" "Prælectiones Academicæ;" "Sequel of the Argument against Divorce;" "Women Laboring in the Lord;" "Pentecostal Fear;" "Litany of our Lord's Warnings;" and "Selections from Hooker on the Sacraments."

F. W. H.

GEOGRAPHY AND TRAVELS.

MAJORCA has not come within the circle of ordinary European travel, nor found a place in Bradshaw; yet has the attractions of a contented, courteous, unsophisticated, patriarchal population; of a delicious climate, exceedingly varied scenery, a superb cathedral, and the magnificent cave of Arta.* Captain Clayton was charmed by the courtesy to strangers, the moderation of hotel charges, the actual absence of suffering and crime. Madrid pleased him far less, with its scorching heat or biting cold, its miserable misgovernment and stagnation of business, its forlorn position, and general poverty. But its gallery full of real gems, such as sixty-four pictures by Velasquez, forty-six Murillos, forty-three Titians, ten Claudes, sixty-two Rubens, and ten Raphaels, collected from the Escorial, La Granga, and El Pardo, charmed him beyond measure. And yet, with all this inspiration at its capital, art is dead in Spain; the English are the chief admirers in the royal museums; silence broods over these wonders of art; the instinctive reflection is, regret that so peerless a collection lies not within reach of most of those whom it would quicken and cheer.

* The Sunny South. An Autumn in Spain and Majorca. By Capt. J. W. CLAYTON. London: 1869.

The Escorial was too gloomy for this lively officer; decay confronted him everywhere; the grim statues and fading frescos harmonize too well with the burial purpose of the vast pile. Gerona, however, capped the climax of desolation, — every thing crumbling and passing away, without any hope of change, any desire to resist the process of dissolution. But every part of Spain is forlorn as can be: an exceedingly fertile country produces very little to-day; a once enterprising people lie as if palsy-stricken; the mightiest of monarchies can hardly cope with a rebellion in one of its islands; an intelligent race presents hardly a specimen of living literature. Captain Clayton doubts about the resurrection of this buried glory; he magnifies the tyranny of the Jesuits, the craft of the priests, the superstition of the people. In evidence of the brutality of the people, he tells of a seven-years-old girl whom the yells of the audience drove, against her will, up the tight-rope of a theatre, and then jeered and hissed when she succeeded. He did not witness the provincial juntas governing themselves after the queen's flight, showing their capacity for independent jurisdiction; he has not faith enough in republican principles to see this impoverished government working its way, through repeated disappointment, not at once to the stand-point of a prosperous republic, but to some constitutional form of monarchy, which will certainly educate the nation for something better in the future.

F. W. H.

IN the *Yo Semite Book*,* the most thoroughly American and most interesting work of the kind, Professor Whitney furnishes a minute guide to that wonderful scenery which he has spent several years in studying and making known. In 1864, Congress granted this gorge to California, to be held for ever for the recreation of the nation. Its true name, Alwahnee, is now merged for ever in that of an Indian chief, Yo Semite, or Grizzly Bear. Its distance from San Francisco, in a direct line, is one hundred and fifty-five miles, nearly half of which can be travelled on wheels. Ten days are necessary for the trip, including three days for the survey of the valley. The distinguishing features of the place are, the gigantic cliffs on either side; the vast height of the vertical walls compared with the width of the opening; the small amount of debris at the bases of the mountains; and the magnificence

* The *Yo Semite Book*: a Description of the Yo Semite Valley and the adjacent Region of the Sierra Nevada, and of the Big Trees of California. J. D. WHITNEY, State Geologist. New York: 1868.

of the waterfalls. Gavarnie, in the Pyrenees, the highest European cataract, has a vertical descent of one thousand two hundred and sixty-six feet. Voring Foss, the grandest, falls eight hundred and fifty feet, but can only be seen from above. The Bridal Veil, in the Yo Semite, has a descent of nine hundred feet. The Virgin's Tears, on the other side, about one thousand; and the Yo Semite Fall, two thousand six hundred feet in all. In fact, there are five grand cataracts in this limited space, the highest far surpassing any other in the world; and each of the others, in the water-season, abundantly repaying a visit.

The big trees lie in eight groups; one of them numbering three hundred and sixty-five, and another six hundred. One set has four trees over three hundred feet in height; the "Mother of the Forest" is sixty-one feet in circumference, without its bark, at six feet above the ground; and several trees in the Mariposa Grove are nearly ninety feet at the ground. A hunter stumbled upon them first in the year 1852. His story was not believed. At last, the reality was found to exceed his description; and now the travel of the world is slowly turning towards what has lain hid until modern facilities of locomotion bring the prize within reach. It is well that some one is charged with the business of watching over these precious memorials of the past. It is well that they are no nearer to the great mart of Pacific commerce. It is well that so young a State as California has entrusted to a thoroughly competent person (the head of the Mining School at Cambridge) the business of revealing its natural treasures to the world at large. The twenty-eight photographs, the great charms of the book, are perfectly beautiful: indeed, the book exists for their sake. F. W. H.

ALTHOUGH his "Last Rambles" * are not a recent experience, it is one which Catlin has a peculiar right to tell, having devoted his life, talent, and fortune to an expiring race. Some pleasant stories of hunting rattlesnakes, ostriches, and kangaroos, are given as a sauce to the banquet; then Catlin enters a stout protest against the idea of the Indians having come from any other continent to this, — insisting that they were created here, and at the time other races were created. One hundred and twenty tribes have given him their distinct traditions of the deluge, and their peculiar theory of creation; the Maerdans believing they were created under ground; the Choctaws that they were created crawfish; the Sioux that they

* Last Rambles among the Indians of the Rocky Mountains. By GEORGE CATLIN. London: Sampson Low, 1868.

were made from red pipe-stone ; and at least half the tribes, that man was put together in a rocky cavern. If this patient student of Indian traditions is right, these aborigines cannot be immigrants from Asiatic lands, least of all the Lost Tribes of Israel.

Mr. Catlin is very severe upon our government for heaping such unutterable wrongs upon the helpless proprietors of the soil. He encountered a gathering of Apache women and children, who were starving because United States soldiers had killed the warriors, destroyed the villages, and turned out these helpless ones literally into the wilderness to perish.

Everywhere he describes the buffaloes, upon which the Western Indians depend for subsistence, as being killed by wholesale for their skins,—insuring in no distant future the extermination of whole Indian tribes by famine. Then the unsparing hostility of the new settlers, especially the gold hunters in the Rocky Mountains, who introduce deadly diseases among the savages, furnish them with the worst kind of whiskey, and murder not a few with hardly any provocation. It seems hoping against hope to expect Indian agents who will do any thing but outrage every instinct of justice in the red man ; frontiersmen, who will not help the savage to become more brutal by the worst vices of civilization ; a particle of that fatherly regard for its weakest children, which is the nauseating pretence of our national rulers. No wonder that Catlin speaks kindly of his generous hosts. Fourteen years of his life have been spent among them, sometimes just after they had been outraged, when they were smarting under robbery, and maddened by spoliations ; yet everywhere the same friendly welcome, the same ready aid, the same truthful counsel has been given. His theory that the Crows are the original Aztecs we ought to mention as receiving the sanction of Humboldt, from the resemblance of Catlin's portraits to those presented by the ruins in Yucatan and Palenque.

F. W. H.

“GRETTIR the Strong,” * the second greatest saga of Iceland, is a simple prose narrative, interspersed with bits of poetry, in commemoration of an Iceland Hercules, who kills his first man by mischance, is obliged to flee from the island, delivers Norway by feats of strength from the malicious berserks, slays a braggart who insults him ; and

* Story of Grettir the Strong, translated from the Icelandic by EIRIKER MAGNUSS and WILLIAM MORRIS. London : Ellis. 12mo. 1869.

so rushes on in a career which makes him an outlaw with a price upon his head, the object of innumerable plots, at last the victim of witchcraft along with his youngest brother. After this cowardly murder, public opinion turns against his murderer, who is driven into exile, enlists as a soldier in Norway, and thus expects to escape the vengeance of Grettir's elder brother. But the short sword of his victim betrays ; he is slain at once ; a married lady of wealth and rank buys out the slayer from his dungeon and his doom ; she falls in love with him, and they are married. Finally, they expiate their self-indulgence by monastic life at Rome, where their days end in blameless devotion. This ancient specimen of Icelandic art is surpassingly simple, sometimes beautiful, touching, and eloquent : it is filled with historical detail, and through its rare completeness will be the most treasured of these ancient poems. The moral, though never obtruded, is distinctly enough seen. Like every hero of the Samson sort, Grettir finds his marvellous strength, unattended by common sense, a curse rather than a blessing. Destiny seems to drive him on from outrage after outrage, to exile, hatred, fear, despair, an early grave. Having no self-command, he is never out of trouble. Hardly one of his victims but was happier than himself. His family and friends were injured the most by his rare physical gifts. The story seems only an exaggeration of what may often have occurred in the days of those fierce sea-kings. Their rugged isle nourished rugged natures, which, not content with battling the elements, made themselves renowned by bloody adventures on sea and land, kept up a state of chronic warfare at home, and yet live before us, after eight centuries, in grand proverbs, noble thoughts, generous purposes, and heroic achievements.

F. W. H.

THROUGH his acquaintance with the native tongue, his perseverance in exploring every part, his study of nature, and his hopefulness of spirit, Professor Pajkull's summer trip has done Iceland some justice, even in a translation.* He finds the importation of brandy on the increase, the clergy imbibing freely, seven quarts to a man being the annual consumption of the whole island. The people, as well as the clergy, and especially the physicians, need education ; the want of ventilation in their low huts, the prevailing filthiness of living, and

* A Summer in Iceland. By C. W. PAJKULL, Professor of Geology at the University of Upsala. London : Chapman, 1868.

the lack of intelligent medical treatment, causing the population to be decimated every little while by epidemics. Besides this plague of wasting disease, volcanic eruptions sweep away many a farmer with his herds, devastate the fields, and expose the survivors to fever as well as famine. Nor does this complete the chapter of woes. Denmark has systematically neglected, and a long time oppressed, its distant dependency ; so that, a few years past, the natives were nearly obliged to freeze as well as starve, and population decreased rapidly. Now, however, every thing promises better, though French coasters still steal the Iceland fish, though the commerce of the world is shut against the Iceland merchant, and the ruling country continues ignorant of the island's great want. The Protestant Reformation expelled the Catholic priesthood, threw education back, and has ever been regarded as a national calamity. But the monopoly of trade, which the Danish government sold for its own benefit, has sometimes threatened the hardy islanders with extinction, driven many to emigrate, and caused the death of not less than nine thousand persons in three years' time. The partially occupied land permits no pleasure-travel. Streams must be forded, deserts crossed, vast lava-beds stumbled over, terrible storms faced, and the meanest lodging accepted thankfully. Still it pays. So much that is curious is to be seen at the Geysers, so many grand prospects are to be enjoyed, such a strange people invite one's study, that an adventurous traveller like this scientific professor is more than repaid for his hardships and perils.

F. W. H.

IN "The Polar World,"* a careful scholar already known by three publications of a similar kind, has furnished a full history of all that has been done, discovered, and experienced, in the Arctic or Antarctic seas. He has given, in fact, an encyclopædia of the geography, natural and political history, native tribes, commercial enterprises of the Polar regions. But his purpose of crowding into small space a vast fund of valuable information has not made the narrative tedious, or deprived the reader of many a thrilling adventure. The terrible experiences of Castren and Middendorff, of Wrangel and Steller, of Hudson and Franklin, mingle with the cheering successes of Parry and Kane, to make a narrative abundantly varied and altogether satis-

* *The Polar World.* By Dr. G. HARTWIG. London: Longmans, 1869. 8vo, pp. 548.

fyng ; while fuller accounts of the native inhabitants are given than any one book has yet attempted ; and those accounts commend themselves as truthful, avoiding poetical eulogy, and yet showing the favorable side of aboriginal character.

It shows the power of our nature to transform the dullest scene, that the miserable Fuegians — to whom a nail is a great gift, whose hunger sometimes drives them to consume their aged women, who occupy the very lowest grade in humanity — are yet attached to their wretched desert, contented with this poor semblance of living, and strangely fond of keeping up this wretched struggle for existence. Those whom Captain Fitzroy carried to England, and educated, fell back at once into savage life, retaining only the language they had acquired ; while the attempt of Captain Gardiner to establish a mission among people who have hardly a trace of any religion, resulted in the missionaries' death by famine. Fortunately, these most southern Americans are exceedingly few ; only the coasts of their island being inhabitable, and that not long in the same spot, because the limpets, or sea-eggs, which make their food, are soon exhausted, and they must move in their canoes to some other pasturage. It requires so little invention to knock a limpet from the rock or gather an edible fungus, or tear up a putrid whale, that their faculties are not developed at all. No arts are practised among them, no progress possible, except by removal to a more favored region ; and yet every visitor finds them not only contented but happy in this forlorn condition.

F. W. H.

ALGERIA presents poor material for bookmaking. The general desolation of the country, the filthiness of the inhabitants, the unchangeableness of Arabic customs, have been exhausted by more picturesque writers than Dr. Naphegyi ; * still, a very lively book and one certain to be popular has been made of some unusual perils, some romantic stories, and the slightest possible mixture of instructive incident. The practice of his profession probably raised him at times out of utter destitution, made him valuable friends, and sent him onward in his vague pilgrimage. At least, this is the only mystery about these adventures.

The gathering of coral in the Mediterranean is the only point that smacks of novelty, and this proves neither peculiarly interesting nor

* *Among the Arabs*, by G. Naphegyi, M.D. Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1868. 12mo.

profitable. After narrating this, and some Bluebeard stories from Moorish annals, the ingenious doctor darts off suddenly into the midst of Polish or Mexican life, and vaults back again without ceremony into the heart of the desert, leaving upon the bewildered reader the same confused vision which the kaleidoscope gave to our childhood, but investing himself everywhere with peculiar skill in captivating the affections of Arab and European, male and female alike.

F. W. H.

NEW PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED.

The Newcomes; Memoirs of a most Respectable Family. Edited by Arthur Pendennis, Esq. By William Makepeace Thackeray. New York: Harper & Brothers.

Adventures of Philip, on his Way through the World; showing who robbed him, who helped him, and who passed him by. By William Makepeace Thackeray. With Illustrations by the Author. 8vo, paper. pp. 267. 50 cts. New York: Harper & Brothers.

Sights and Sensations in France, Germany, and Switzerland: or, Experiences of an American Journalist in Europe. The Bubbles of Champagne; Hombourg and Baden-Baden; a Tramp in the Bernese Oberland; The Foundling Hospital of Paris; a Chamber of Horrors; the Closerie de Silas; the Quartier Latin, &c. By Edward Gould Buffum, author of "Six Months in the Gold Mines," &c. 12mo, cloth. pp. 310. \$1.50. New York: Harper & Brothers.

Stretton: a Novel. By Henry Kingsley, author of "Hetty," "Geoffrey Hamlyn," "Ravenshoe," &c. 8vo, paper. pp. 144. 40 cts. New York: Harper & Brothers.

My Daughter Elinor: a Novel. 8vo, paper. pp. 257. \$1.25. New York: Harper & Brothers.

Elements of Astronomy: designed for Academies and High Schools. By Elias Loomis, LL.D., Professor of Natural Philosophy and Astronomy in Yale College, and author of a "Course of Mathematics." 12mo, pp. 250. \$1.50. New York: Harper & Brothers.

Famous London Merchants: a book for boys. By H. R. Fox Bourne, author of "English Merchants," "English Seamen under the Tudors," "A Memoir of Sir Philip Sidney," &c. With twenty-five Illustrations. 16mo, cloth. pp. 295. \$1.00. New York: Harper & Brothers.

Cord and Creese. By the author of "The Dodge Club." With Illustrations. 8vo, paper. pp. 199. 75 cts. New York: Harper & Brothers.

Foul Play: a Novel. By Charles Reade, author of "White Lies," "Love me Little, Love me Long," "It is Never too Late to Mend," "Hard Cash," "Griffith Gaunt, or Jealousy," "Peg Woffington," "Christie Johnstone," &c., and Dion Boucicault. 8vo, paper. pp. 148. 25 cts. New York: Harper & Brothers.

The Philosophy of Teaching: the Teacher, the Pupil, the School. By Nathaniel Sauls. 8vo, cloth. pp. 60. \$1.00. New York: Harper & Brothers.

A Parser and Analyzer for Beginners, with diagrams and suggestive pictures. By Francis A. March, Professor of the English Language and Com-

parative Philology in Lafayette College, author of "Method of Philological Study of the English Language," "Comparative Grammar of the Anglo-Saxon Language," &c. 16mo, cloth. pp. 86. 40 cts. New York: Harper & Brothers.

Hetty. By Henry Kingsley, author of "Stretton," "Geoffrey Hamlyn," "Ravenshoe," &c. 8vo, paper. pp. 69. 25 cts. New York: Harper & Brothers.

The Pictorial Field-Book of the War of 1812; or, Illustrations, by Pen and Pencil, of the History, Biography, Scenery, Relics, and Traditions of the last War for American Independence. By Benson J. Lossing. With several hundred engravings on wood, by Lossing and Parritt, chiefly from original sketches by the author. Royal 8vo, cloth. pp. 1073. \$7.00. New York: Harper & Brothers.

Cottage Piety Exemplified. By the author of "Union to Christ," "Love to God," &c. 16mo, cloth. pp. 316. \$1.25. Philadelphia: J. B. Lipincott & Co.

History of European Morals, from Augustus to Charlemagne. By William Edward Hartpole Lecky, M.A. In two vols. 8vo, cloth. pp. 892. \$6.00. New York: D. Appleton & Co.

Paper from over the Water. A series of letters from Europe. By Sinclair Tousey. 12mo, cloth. pp. 204. \$1.50. New York: American News Co.

The Dead Guest: a Mysterious Story. By Heinrich Zschokke. Translated from the German by George C. McWhorter, M.A. 8vo, paper. pp. 109. 50 cts. New York: D. Appleton & Co.

The Lost Manuscript: a Novel. By Gustave Freytag, author of "Debit and Credit." Translated by Mrs. Malcolm. Complete in one volume. 8vo, paper. pp. 259. 75 cts. New York: D. Appleton & Co.

Views of Life: Addresses on the Social and Religious Questions of the Age. W. T. Moore. 12mo, cloth. pp. 351. \$1.50. Cincinnati: R. W. Carroll & Co.

Jeremiah and his Lamentations. With Notes, critical, explanatory, and practical, designed for both pastors and people. By Rev. Henry Cowles, D.D. "Understandest thou what thou readest? And he said, How can I, except some man should guide me?"—Acts viii. 30, 31. 12mo, cloth. pp. 431. \$2.25. New York: Appleton & Co.

Diomede: from the Iliad of Homer. By William R. Smith. 8vo, paper. pp. 52. New York: D. Appleton & Co.

A Latin Reader; consisting of Selections from Phædrus, Cæsar, Curtius, Nepos, Sallust, Ovid, Virgil, Plautus, Terence, Cicero, Pliny, and Tacitus. Prepared by William F. Allen and Joseph H. Allen. Boston: Edwin Ginn.

A General Vocabulary of Latin. Prepared by Joseph H. Allen. Boston: Edwin Ginn.

Studies in Philosophy and Theology. By Joseph Haven, Professor in Chicago Theological Seminary. Andover: W. F. Draper. pp. 502.

The Office and Work of the Christian Ministry. By James M. Hoppin, Professor of Homiletics and Pastoral Theology in Yale College. New York: Sheldon & Co. 8vo, pp. 175.

Villa Eden: the Country-House on the Rhine. By Berthold Auerbach. Translated by C. C. Shackford. Boston: Roberts Brothers. 8vo, pp. 549.

Cipher: a Romance. By Jane B. Austin. New York: Sheldon & Co. 8vo, pp. 175.

A Compendious Grammar of Attic Greek, with copious Exercises. By Charles D. Morris. New York: F. J. Huntington & Co. pp. 330.

American Edition of Dr. William Smith's Dictionary of the Bible. New York: Hurd & Houghton. Part 19. Moses—New Testament.